One Hundred Brief Bible Studies

B studies - 100
" study by theme

One Hundred Brief Bible Studies.

BY

J. B. SHEARER, D. D., L. L. D.

Professor of Biblical Instruction, Davidson College, N. C.; Author of Bible Course Syllabus; Modern Mysticism; Studies in the Life of Christ; Sermon on the Mount; The Scriptures, Fundamental Facts and Features; Selected Old Testament Studies; and Hebrew Institutions, Social and Civil.

———

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA:
PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION.
1912.

CD
64
5539

COPYRIGHT BY
J. B. SHEARER
1912

Richmond Press, Inc.
Richmond, Va.

Dedication

TO THE GRATEFUL MEMORY OF MY FATHER, JOHN AKERS SHEARER, AND MY MOTHER, RUTH AKERS SHEARER, WHO TAUGHT ME THE SCRIPTURES FROM MY YOUTH.

Table of Contents.

		Page
No. 1.	The Seven Days of Moses	13
No. 2.	Condition of the Earth Prior to Day One	14
No. 3.	"Created and Made"	14
No. 4.	The Two Creations of Man	15
No. 5.	"A Living Soul"	16
No. 6.	Primitive Geography	17
No. 7.	Institution of Marriage	18
No. 8.	Institution of the Sabbath	19
No. 9.	The Sabbath—What Is It?	20
No. 10.	The Sabbath—Is it Permanent?	21
No. 11.	Modifications of the Sabbath	22
No. 12.	The Standard of Sabbath Observance	23
No. 13.	Cain's Rebuke	24
No. 14.	Cain's Apostasy	25
No. 15.	Early Populations	26
No. 16.	The Covenants of the Bible	28
No. 17.	Dietetics	30
No. 18.	Noah's Occupation	32
No. 19.	Noah's Curse and Prophecy	33
No. 20.	The Settlement of Noah's Sons	35
No. 21.	Early Migrations	36
No. 22.	The Genealogies	38
No. 23.	The Origin of Language	40
No. 24.	Babel	43
No. 25.	Origin of Racial Types	45
No. 26.	The Shortening of Human Life	48
No. 27.	Who Were the Hebrews?	49
No. 28.	Who Was Melchizedek?	50
No. 29.	Isaac's Faith	52
No. 30.	Jacob and Esau	54
No. 31.	Jacob and Rachel	55
No. 32.	Temporary Incarnations	56
No. 33.	The Valley of Salt. Lot's Wife	62
No. 34.	Early Chronology	65
No. 35.	Later Chronology	67
No. 36.	The Battle of the Gods	69

No. 37. EGYPT'S OVERTHROW 72
No. 38. THE WALL OF EGYPT 76
No. 39. THE WATER SUPPLY IN THE DESERT 78
No. 40. APOSTASIES 81
No. 41. AMALEK'S CURSE 85
No. 42. ISRAEL, A COMPOSITE PEOPLE 88
No. 43. THE DECALOGUE 92
No. 44. IDOLATRY 95
No. 45. EPOCHS IN HISTORY 99
No. 46. MONUMENTAL CUSTOMS 101
No. 47. THE THREE GREAT FEASTS 105
No. 48. THE SABBATICAL YEAR. TWO JUBILEES 107
No. 49. PROVISION FOR THE POOR 110
No. 50. MOSES AND THE VEIL 112
No. 51. THE TWO TABERNACLES 115
No. 52. THE TWO COMMONWEALTHS 117
No. 53. THE GOLDEN CANDLESTICK 120
No. 54. SACRIFICIAL OFFERINGS. TWO CLASSES 122
No. 55. BLOODY OFFERINGS. FOUR CLASSES 125
No. 56. THE MEAT OFFERING 127
No. 57. RULES FOR OFFERINGS. THEIR SIGNIFICANCE 129
No. 58. HOLY FIRE 131
No. 59. TYPES AND SYMBOLS IN WORSHIP 132
No. 60. THE BLOOD OF SPRINKLING 135
No. 61. FREEWILL OFFERINGS AND VOWS 137
No. 62. SOJOURN IN THE WILDERNESS. ITS SIGNIFICANCE .. 139
No. 63. CONTINUOUS MIRACLES 142
No. 64. MURMURINGS AND REBELLIONS 144
No. 65. KORAH, DATHAN AND ABIRAM 148
No. 66. EXTERMINATION OF THE CANAANITES 150
No. 67. THE GIANTS 152
No. 68. THE JUDGES 154
No. 69. JEPHTHAH'S VOW 155
No. 70. LEPROSY 157
No. 71. THE BIBLE STATUS OF WAR 159
No. 72. DAVID, THE SHEPHERD LAD 163
No. 73. DAVID AND JONATHAN 165
No. 74. DAVID AND SAUL 167
No. 75. DAVID AND THE AMMONITES 170
No. 76. WITCHCRAFT 172
No. 77. THE DUELLO. ORDEAL 175

No. 78. HIRAM, KING OF TYRE 177
No. 79. AHAB AND JEZEBEL 180
No. 80. REBUILDING OF JERICHO 182
No. 81. JOSIAH AND THE BOOK OF THE LAW 184
No. 82. RENEWALS OF THE COVENANT 187
No. 83. NOAH, DANIEL AND JOB 190
No. 84. THE BOOK OF ESTHER 192
No. 85. THE LOT 194
No. 86. THE CANTICLES 197
No. 87. PROVERBS 200
No. 88. THE SIGN OF THE PROPHET JONAH 202
No. 89. ENOCH AND ELIJAH. IMMORTALITY 203
No. 90. INFALLIBILITY, INSPIRATION, INERRANCY 205
No. 91. LIMITS OF INSPIRATION 207
No. 92. WHO WERE THE SAMARITANS? 208
No. 93. THE LOST TEN TRIBES 210
No. 94. PROSELYTISM 212
No. 95. SEVENTY YEARS OF CAPTIVITY. HOW COUNTED ... 214
No. 96. JEWISH SECTS 216
No. 97. JEWISH SECTS. THEIR TENETS 218
No. 98. ON-BETHSHEMESH-BETH AVEN-HELIOPOLIS 222
No. 99. LOGIC OF EVENTS 224
No. 100. THE SCRIPTURES,—CHRISTOCENTRIC 228

PREFACE.

The Author of this little volume has been engaged in teaching the English Bible to college students for forty-two years. He first published his Bible Course Syllabus which is a three-year course of lessons in three small volumes. He has since published six small 12-mo. volumes of Bible studies as set forth on the title page. He now offers this, the seventh of the series. His aim has been to put into permanent form the results of his life-long studies, such as are not found readily in the commentaries. Things new and old are combined in such a way as to lay some claim to originality. Critics have been so kind as to speak of them all in terms almost extravagant. Their kind words have excited the profoundest gratitude to God that I have been permitted, and, may I not say, divinely helped to study and teach his word.

This little volume offers one hundred brief expositions and discussions which seem to me as well worthy of preservation as the longer and more formal discussions found in the other volumes. A judicious friend and critic who has kept up with the manuscript, as written, assures me that this volume will be the "most valuable of them all."

I may be permitted to lay it at the feet of the Master on my eightieth birthday, with unspeakable gratitude that he has honored me with this service, and for the long life of prosperity and blessing he has given me. "My cup runneth over."

J. B. SHEARER.

Davidson, N. C., July 19, 1912.

Brief Bible Studies.

No. 1.

The Seven Days.

Genesis 1.

By the simplest law of arithmetic they were all similar days, and of the same denomination. Let us examine the first and the seventh. Day one had darkness and light, evening and morning, and the division of night and day, all corresponding to each other and defining each other. The usage of these terms is the same in all ages and in all languages, and allows no laborious exegesis to explain them all away.

Day seven was the day of rest after six days of creation. Gen. 2:1–3. The natural division for chapters would be at the end of verse 3. Here we learn that "God rested on the seventh day," and "blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that *in it* he had rested, etc." By comparing the fourth commandment we learn that the day he rested and sanctified was the seventh day Sabbath. Day seven as well as day one was a natural day and can't be explained away. Q. E. D. All seven were natural days.

No. 2.

CONDITION OF THE EARTH JUST PRIOR TO DAY ONE.

Gen. 1:2.

It is evident that the earth had a long history of ages on ages after the "beginning" of verse 1. A great epoch closed with a great deluge, which is now distinctly recognized. Moses describes the condition:

1. The earth was covered with water.
2. Darkness was over the face of the deep.
3. The earth was "without form," without beauty, without a cosmos, without arrangement, such as we see to-day.
4. The earth was "void," empty of life—a dead world. Moses' words are aptly rendered, "waste and desolation."
5. There was no proper atmosphere or "firmament."

These conditions cohere with each other, and aptly describe the condition of things during the postglacial deluge, which broke up the ice age from six to ten thousand years ago, according to Sir William Dawson, and other high authorities.

Just here Moses' account of creation begins with "day one," until the present cosmos is created in six days.

No. 3.

"CREATED AND MADE."

The Scriptures teach us that there were two modes of creation, absolute and relative. Absolute creation originated matter and spirit. Relative creation used materials already in existence. Both kinds are recorded

in Genesis, but not distinguished from each other, as many suppose.

The two Hebrew words "Bara" and "Hasa," one translated "create," and the other "make," are used interchangeably. This is readily seen from the English translation. Compare Gen. 1; 7, 21, 25, 26, 27; and 2:2, 3, 4. They are used once together, exhaustively, 2:2, "created and made." It is mischievous to insist on false distinctions. However, we do not propose here to discuss the whole doctrine of creation. It is the surface doctrine of the Scriptures.

No. 4.

"THE TWO CREATIONS OF MAN."

Gen. 1:26, 27; and Gen. 2:7.

Chapter one sketches creation in bold outline. Chapter two is supplementary, and explanatory of several things that might not readily be included in the main sketch.

We have first the absolute creation of man, "a male and a female," in the "image" of God. There is no reference here to the body of either. The distinction of sex is in the spirit of each, whether in the body or out of the body. In chapter two we have an account of the creation of the bodies of the man and of the woman—bodies materially different from each other, but exactly suited to the two personal spirits that should occupy them. There was evidently an appreciable difference of time between these two creations, one succeeding the other.

The Scriptures uphold us in saying that the body is not necessary to the spirit, and they do dwell together or apart according to the divine pleasure, and the body

shall be modified for changed conditions in another life. At death the body dies, the spirit lives. At the resurrection they shall be reunited.

No. 5.

"A LIVING SOUL."

Gen 2:7.

The duality of man is the surface doctrine of the Bible. Matter and spirit, body and soul, constitute a personality. The names heart, mind, soul, and spirit are given to the part made in the image of God; and the body, made of the dust of the ground, has an organic life exactly analogous to lower forms of life which have no spiritual essence. This we get from the Mosaic account of creation:

1. Man's spirit was created in the image of God "in knowledge, righteousness and true holiness with dominion over creatures."

2. God made a body for him out of the dust of the ground exactly analogous to the organic bodies of plants and animals.

3. God breathed into this body the "breath of life." There is no suggestion here of anything more than the life of the body—no reference to the moral, intellectual and spiritual man.

4. The result of this was in accord—"He became a living soul"—a "living creature," as the Hebrew words "Nephesh Hayyah" are variously rendered. They are applied in the same sense to the denizens of the deep, to the fowls of the air, and to all the cattle and beasts and moving things of the earth. They are all "living souls" (Nephesh Hayyah) in the same sense.

It is unfortunate that this passage has been perverted to teach the doctrine of the "soul." This doctrine stands or falls with the former statement, "God created man in his own image." It is also reinforced throughout the entire Scriptures.

No. 6.

PRIMITIVE GEOGRAPHY, OR ADAM LAND.

The Garden of Eden has not been located, nor the country called Eden. They were presumably in a beautiful section of Armenia along the Euphrates. The garden was not so large that Adam and Eve and their immediate posterity might not dress it and keep it under divine guidance. It lay on both sides of a stream that arose in Eden and watered it. Verse 10, first clause.

The writer would suggest a period here and a new paragraph, and render it literally thus, "From thence there was Division (it was parted, an impersonal verb), and there were four principal Divisions." After the expulsion from Eden the race spread out into four great settlements—Cain and his descendants moving eastward.

They developed their civilizations along the great rivers just as they did after the flood and for the same reasons; and the rivers furnished the names.

1. The Pison. Why not accept the statement of scholars that this was the Indus on the east of Asia, yielding gold and precious stones, then and now?

2. The Gihon—the Nile on the extreme west. Other rivers were called Gihon by the ancients, but this Gihon compassed the land of Ethiopia, the Abyssinia of to-day. The word "compassed" used both of the Indus and the Nile is significant, and helps the identification.

3. The Hiddekel — confessedly the Tigris. Dekel means swift, and was transliterated into Teger, which means swift—our Tigris. The syllable Hid also means swift and the double name Hiddekel is intensive and represents the rapid current of the river.

4. The Euphrates. There can be no question of the identity of this great river.

On these four great rivers were located the four great divisions of the Adam land—India, Central Asia, and North Africa. Dawson and the Duke of Argyle assure us of traces of pre-historic and antediluvian man outside of these boundaries.

Why try to find the Adam land in the Pacific Ocean or in other impossible places when the Bible account is so simple and easy? Why not accept Moses' theory?

According to this exegesis these four rivers have nothing in common, and have no connection with the garden of Eden. But they give names to the Adam Lands, rather to the four great divisions of antediluvian geography.

No. 7.

THE INSTITUTION OF MARRIAGE.

Gen. 2:23–25.

The first unity in the race was the marriage bond making two one. "The twain shall be one flesh." This unity in the first case seemed to spring out of creation itself. There is a curious use of the singular and the plural, "him" and "them," in Gen. 5:1, 2. They were two and yet one, and he called their name Adam as if there were but one, and the two made the one "image and likeness" of God.

The next unity is that of the parent and the child. When this unity has fulfilled its purpose it is dissolved in the interest of a new unit: "A man shall leave his father and his mother and cleave unto his wife and the twain shall be one flesh."

The primordial unit is the family—an indissoluble unity until sin ate into the vitals of the race. And even then only one sin can destroy it, as we might easily show. Moses and Christ were agreed on these points. Deut. 24-1–4; Matt. 5:32.

Monogamy is the essential law of the race—one man for one woman. Creation made a man and a woman a unit. Every new marriage made a new unit. This is no mere figure of speech, but an absolute reality.

The object is a "holy seed." The family is the place to originate, propogate and train this "holy seed." Malachi argues this with telling power, 2:15. He cites these essential and universal facts; he argues the purpose of the creative act in order to expose and rebuke the folly and the treachery of his people's laxity in their marriage bonds.

Monogamy is grounded in the very nature of things.

No. 8.

INSTITUTION OF THE SABBATH.

Gen. 2:1, 2; Ex. 20:8–11.

There were two primordial institutions, the family and the Sabbath. One furnished the place and the other the time for training a "holy seed." These were instituted as needful for the race before man sinned.

But for the fall spiritual worship in the family and on the Sabbath would have sufficed to preserve holiness in the self-propagating race.

After the fall the conflict between sin and holiness has raged most fiercely—Satan on the one side and the Redeemer on the other. Man is to be saved or lost. How much more evident is it then that the destinies of the race were then, have ever been, and are now wrapped up in these two institutions.

The ordinances of worship were multiplied and enlarged by the addition of ritual and ceremonial worship which, after four thousand years, was discontinued, and original, spiritual worship remained till the end of time.

Was the Sabbath instituted at the beginning? Gen. 2:1, 2 seems to teach it. We find Noah observing seven day periods during the flood. We find the Hebrews observing the Sabbath in a wholesale way in the wilderness before they reached Sinai, and that without any command to do so, when the manna was given. Ex. chap. 16. Then at Mount Sinai the Decalogue says, "Remember the Sabbath day,"—no new command—not a new institution.

No. 9.

THE SABBATH—WHAT IS IT?

Gen. 2:1, 2; Ex. 20:8–11.

The primary meaning of "Sabbath" is cessation; then rest; then rest for religious purposes; cessation from ordinary occupations in order to engage in the ordinances of worship, mainly spiritual.

The Sabbath, with the definite article, signifies the seventh day of the week. The two are used interchangeably in the fourth commandment, "The seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Sometimes the Lord calls it "My Sabbath." This definite usage in the sin-

gular number with the definite article or a definite pronoun runs entirely through the Scriptures.

Every other day set apart from ordinary vocations for religious purposes was also a Sabbath. There were a number of these in the Jewish ritual—fast days and festal days. They need not be enumerated. Anyone of these is spoken of as "a Sabbath." When several are referred to, or the whole class, they are called "Sabbaths" in the plural. These plural Sabbaths may not be confounded with the seventh day Sabbath.

Failure to note these simple distinctions in Scripture usage has led to great confusion and still greater mischief. Compare Col. 2:16. This and similar passages are relied on to abolish "The Sabbath" and set up the continental view.

No. 10.

"THE SABBATH"—IS IT OF PERMANENT BINDING AUTHORITY?

We answer, yes. The argument is easy.

1. It dates back to the beginning, and is co-ordinate with the family, of equal date. Who will say that the family is not a permanent institution? We have already seen their co-ordination.

2. It was based on a reason, "Because in it He had rested," etc. Who will explain away or supersede this reason?

3. Its permanence is emphasized more and more throughout the Scriptures. The prophets were the restorers of the old paths and they also projected the Sabbath into Messianic times. It is certain that no one minimized it in Christ's day.

4. Certain theocratic features were engrafted upon it at Mount Sinai which fell away in due season without affecting the authority of the day.

5. The crowning argument is this. It is a part of the Decalogue, the moral law. The two tables are a perpetual binding covenant. The ten are summed up in two and then in one. They are all so correlated that they stand or fall together, so that a breach of one is in a proper sense a breach of all.

No. 11.

MODIFICATIONS OF THE SABBATH.

We often hear of the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sabbath, as if in contrast, but we find no satisfactory definition of the difference between the two. The contrast is usually noted at the expense of the Jewish Sabbath.

We prefer a three-fold classification: The universal Sabbath, the Jewish Sabbath, and the Christian Sabbath.

1. The universal Sabbath was set up at the beginning, was observed in the ages, was proclaimed on Mount Sinai and written on two tables of stone. Its true nature has already been discussed. In its essence it has been, and will continue the same in all ages.

2. The Jewish Sabbath. One additional feature was engrafted on it, and only one. "The Sabbath" was adopted as the sign of the covenant between God and the children of Israel forever—a perpetual covenant. "Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death." The sin became a crime—a repudiation of the Theocratic rule—high treason. This feature of the Jewish Sabbath lasted no longer than Judaism.

3. The Christian Sabbath. There was one modification and one addition. The day was changed by apostolic usage and the Lord's Day became the Sabbath instead of the seventh, as provided for in Old Testament prophecy.

The addition to the universal Sabbath consisted only in this: the new creation, which was completed by the resurrection of Christ, was henceforth to take the first memorial place in God's holy day, while the old creation took the second place.

No. 12.

THE STANDARD OF SABBATH OBSERVANCE.

Is. 58:13,14.

The divine author of the Sabbath has prescribed the mode and measure of its observance. No man may add to it or take away from it. We may quote Isaiah's summary:

"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

This is the Old Testament standard as Isaiah understood it. We see from the context that his people had gone very far astray in many things. He tells them that if they will return unto the Lord they should be called "The repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths

to dwell in." He then proposes Sabbath observance, as above quoted, as the key to the situation.

Isaiah is in exact accord with the fourth commandment, which is the charter of the universal Sabbath. Questions 58, 59, 60, 61 and 62 of the Shorter Catechism would seem to exhaust the subject as enjoined and argued in the entire Scriptures.

But, says one, "Did not Christ lower the standard and give a larger liberty?" By no means. He only brushed away Pharisaic perversions and puerilities and showed the true standard as found in the Old Testament Scriptures.

No. 13.

CAIN'S REBUKE.

Gen. 4:6, 7.

The worship after the Fall and the expulsion from Eden gave prominence to two typical sacrificial offerings, the bloody offering, and the meat offering, one for atonement and the other for thanksgiving. One was taken from the flock and the other from the products of agriculture.

While Moses did not expound these offerings in his brief record, he and his people understood their significance on the bare mention. In importance the sin offering and atonement by blood was essentially first because of sin; then came the thank offering in grateful recognition of sin forgiven.

Abel by faith as a believing sinner brought the atonement offering. Cain refused to recognize himself as a sinner and denied the doctrine of atonement and the need of it, just as men do to-day. But he was willing

to patronize the Lord with a thank offering. Both parties seem to have had their adherents, somewhat numerous, for it must have been towards the close of the one hundred and thirty years after the creation.

These rival theories were as fundamental then as they are today. They were brought to a test before the Lord. Believing Abel was accepted; unbelieving Cain was rejected, and he was wroth.

He was rebuked and convicted, and Abel's theory was vindicated. "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well sin lieth at the door?" These words may be paraphrased: "If you are no sinner you would be accepted. You are not accepted because you are a sinner. Now as a sinner, the sin offering crouches at the door."

The last clause presents difficulty. "And unto thee shall be his desire and thou shalt rule over him." This translation is bad because the pronouns "he" and "him" have no antecedent to which they can refer. The sin offering is the only possible antecedent; "It is thy need, and by it thou shalt prevail."

In this contest and rebuke the doctrine of sin and atonement is set up for all time.

No. 14.

CAIN'S APOSTASY.

Gen. 4:16.

"Cain went out from the presence of the Lord and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden." Rejected truth delivers a man over to his own passions. The convicted heresiarch was driven to fury. He sought his brother and slew him. He was angry with his God but he wreaked his vengeance on his brother.

God heard the cry of innocent blood, as he always does, and he called him to account and denounced him as a fugitive and a vagabond with a curse upon him. He went into voluntary exile haunted with fear lest someone would execute vengeance upon him.

He and his party apostatized from the true faith and abandoned the place of worship and set up for themselves under the title of "Sons of Men." This indicated a proud and self-sufficient humanitarianism.

Seth now represented the faith of Abel, and his party were called "Sons of God." They maintained true worship in all humility, as the "Sons of God" do to-day.

The apostate family grew rapidly worse as we learn from the brief sketch in Gen. 4:19–24. Polygamy and murder found their domicile there. The separateness was broken down in the course of time. Social barriers no longer saved the truth.

The "Sons of God" and the "Sons of Men" were assimilated into each other. The apostasy ate like a cancer into the vitals of the race till the whole earth was filled with violence, and the "thoughts of men's hearts were evil and only evil continually."

No great apostasy was ever yet cured, except by the logic of events and the destruction of the apostates. So the waters of the flood became a necessity.

No. 15.

EARLY POPULATIONS.

Gen. 1:28; 9:1; and Chap. 5.

The early history is so brief that it is easy to overlook many things expressed or implied, and their necessary significance.

1. Only a few persons are mentioned and they by name, such as were prominent actors in the history—not a single woman by name except Eve.

2. We may infer from the age of the line of patriarchs, as given, that the average normal age of the race before the flood was eight or nine hundred years.

3. The people must have had a corresponding strength of constitution and general health. Sin had not yet produced the physical degeneracy of later times.

4. The patriarchs named from Seth to Noah were in the direct line of the "Sons of God'" One of them was so conspicuously holy that he was translated like Elijah; "Enoch walked with God and was not; for God took him." Gen. 5:24.

5. These patriarchs were not necessarily the "first born" in each family, for Seth was born after the apostasy of Cain, one hundred and thirty years after creation. We do not know how many cases of primogentiture were set aside for good and sufficient reasons.

6. They all "begat sons and daughters;" some, before the birth of the patriarchal son, as in the case of Adam, and all, after.

7. If we follow the analogy of the child-bearing period to-day we may fairly infer that the child-bearing period then was not limited to less than 500 years.

8. The creation blessing was also a command, "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it." The same blessings and command were given to Noah and his sons in covenant after the Flood, and to their seed after them. Gen. 9:1, 7, 9.

9. In the curse after the Fall God said to Eve, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow, and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children." Gen. 3:16. This may mean child bearing greatly multiplied beyond

what was normal as well as multiplied pains and sorrows therewith.

10. From all this we may form an estimate of the multiplied millions on the earth before the Flood, except as decimated by wars, and violence, and consequent pestilence and famine. The old Adam land, as outlined in No. 6, was ample for these teeming millions.

11. From this point of view we may readily understand the rapid growth of nations, peoples and civilizations after the Flood till the time of Abraham.

No. 16.

THE COVENANTS OF THE BIBLE.

A Bible covenant is more than an agreement between parties. It is a matter of divine appointment and administration, simple or complex, with promises and obligations expressed or implied. Man is the other party in interest as a beneficiary, directly or remotely. We wish merely to name and define the covenants.

1. The first and the great covenant is the "Covenant of Grace." It originated in the counsels of eternity with the Father. The Son and the Spirit became its sponsors and administrators.

Man became a party to it through the Son as our federal head and representative, and becomes an actual beneficiary through the work of the spirit.

All the minor covenants were appointed as means to an end—the outworking, completing and perfecting of the great covenant of grace. These minor covenants may be classified as secular and religious.

2. The Creation Covenant. This was a secular covenant. It provided for the needs of the body, established the family relation, and gave man dominion over

animal life by land and sea and air and over the forces of nature. Gen. 1:28; 2:18–25.

3. The Covenant of Works. This was a religious covenant. Gen. 2:16, 17. Man sinned, the covenant was broken and all its benefits were forfeited.

4. A new covenant at once superseded the covenant of works, which we may call the Messianic Covenant in furtherance of the Covenant of Grace. It essayed to redeem man from the curse and blight of sin by a redeemer. This covenant was administered through a ritual and typical system from that time till the Redeemer came, but under varied form and dress.

5. The Covenant with Noah. This was a secular covenant. It recognized the creation covenant as permanent and added several important provisions for the race to the end of time. Gen. 8:21, 22; 9:1–17.

6. The Covenant with Abraham. This is a spiritual covenant. It restates the Messianic covenant in its essence, and is the charter of the church, visible and invisible to the end of time. It also had a secular side in that it guaranteed the land of promise to his seed. Gen. 15. Compare Gal. 3.

7. The Sinaitic Covenant. This was partly secular and partly religious. It appropriated all the previous covenants and arranged the details of a complex administration and added certain things that were new. It became the temporary form and dress of the Abrahamic covenant until its ritual and typical features were fulfilled.

8. The Synagogue Covenant. We assume the divine origin of the Synagogue—of its membership, its officers, its government and its forms of worship. The visible church of Abraham took on this final form overlapping the ritual and typical for several centuries. This be-

came the catholic and universal outer form and dress of the Messianic Covenant.

9. The New Covenant. This embraces all that is distinctive of the Gospel. In it we find the culmination of the Messianic and the Abrahamic Covenants. Their ritual and typical features are fulfilled in the blood of Christ. He says "This is the new covenant in my blood." The Synagogue flows on as the church of Christ in its permanent outward form and dress.

No. 17.

DIETETICS.

Gen. 1:29, 30; 9:3, 4; Levit. 11:2–22; Acts 10: 9–16.

From the beginning until now man has had a divine warrant for all rights, franchises, institutions, pleasures and customs that are good for the body and for social and civil life, as well as for the welfare of the soul. We find all these warrants in multitudinous detail throughout the Scriptures. Food and clothing have been and still are of divine regulation.

We find four great epochs in the history in which the divine warrants or covenants regulating food stand out in great prominence.

1. At creation we find man's warrant for food had one limitation. Cereals, fruits and pottage were given him. Flesh was not allowed. Gen. 1:29, 30. "Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed, and every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat." The same was given to animals also. Vegetarians base their contention largely on this limitation at creation. We do not know how far both animals and man transgressed this limitation before the Flood under the curse and blight of sin and apostasy.

2. In the covenant with Noah which was made for the race till the end of time, the limitation was removed, Gen. 9:3, "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things."

Even then one limitation was made, 9:4, "But the flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat." By comparing Levit. 17:10–15 we find that this forbids the eating of blood and also flesh with blood in it—things strangled or torn or dying of themselves, or game not bled. The reason assigned is that the blood is the life. It has always been so and always will be so. Therefore this limitation is binding for all time.

3. At Mount Sinai large limitations were put upon Noah's warrant which were binding only on Israel; and on them, only until Judaism should be superseded. Moses set up the distinction of clean and unclean meats. Levit. 11:2–22.

These were not sanitary laws, as some argue, but they drew the line at the table and served to keep them a separate people and to protect them from the polluting worship of peoples around them. Levit. 20:22–26.

It is worthy of note that when the prohibition to eat blood was re-enacted at Mount Sinai it was forbidden to the foreigner as well. Levit. 17:12. It was also re-enacted for Gentiles by the council at Jerusalem. Acts 15:29.

We live to-day under the God given warrants of the covenant with Noah. Modern sanitary reformers, under the banner of Science, are poorly engaged in trying to set aside the heritage of the ages.

No. 18.

NOAH'S OCCUPATION.

2 Pet. 2:5.

Peter tells us that Noah was a "preacher of righteousness." Moses tells us that "Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord." "Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God." After man became hopeless in his apostasy God gave them one hundred and twenty years more. He directed Noah meanwhile to prepare the Ark to save a remnant—himself and his house. He was six hundred years old when the Flood came. See Gen. 6.

From these facts we may glean the following, either directly or by fair inference.

1. He exercised his high vocation for more than four hundred years while they were growing worse and worse, and he continued his preaching while he was preparing the Ark for more than a century.

2. He was an extraordinary man, raised up for an extraordinary crisis. He was one of the three great men of the ages most likely to prevail with God in their intercession—"Noah, Daniel and Job." Ezek. 14:14.

3. As a preacher of righteousness he had a commission to give the race a last call, a last warning and a last offer of mercy.

4. He had ample time in his long ministry and especially in the last 120 years to visit all sections of the Adam land from the Indus to the Nile with his warnings, pleadings and denunciations.

5. Was his preaching a failure? By no means. But it was a "savor of death unto death" to the perishing. 2 Cor. 2:15, 16. "He blew the trumpet and warned the people," but they "took not warning." Ezek. 33:1–5.

6. Was his experience exceptional? "As the days of Noah were, so shall the coming of the son of man be." Matt. 24:36–39.

7. He continued his ministry after the Flood for 300 years more as the patriarchal prophet, priest and king of his multiplying posterity. What other preacher ever had such varied and awful experiences from which to illustrate and enforce his teachings?

No. 19.

NOAH'S CURSE AND PROPHECY.

It is not our purpose to discuss Noah's sin of drunkenness. It would hardly have found a place in the history if it had not been the occasion of a very remarkable and far-reaching prophecy.

Ham, the father of Canaan, had put some indignity on his father. "And Noah awoke from his wine and knew what his younger son had done unto him. And he said, "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he said, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant." We may note several things of interest in discussing this matter. Gen. 9:18–27.

1. Japheth was the first born, for Shem is called the brother of Japheth, the elder. Gen. 10:21. Besides, he and his sons are placed first in the genealogies.

2. Ham is called the younger son and he comes second in the genealogies and was probably the second son.

3. Shem's place in the genealogies is the third in order. He was probably the third son.

4. But according to all tradition he enjoyed the birthright and was for centuries the High Priest of his race. It is significant also that he had the place of honor in his father's prophecy. We may now see why the three names are usually mentioned in inverse order, "Shem, Ham and Japheth."

5. The curse and the blessings were spoken by inspiration, as in the case of the prophetic blessings of Isaac and Jacob some centuries later. As the high priest of his family, Noah had the oracle.

6. The very name of Ham was allowed to rot. He is known only as "Ham, the father of Canaan." His name is never mentioned later. Even in the curse and prophecy Canaan is the name of his posterity.

7. Cursed be Canaan. A servant of servants shall he be to his brethren. This should be continuous through all history as is twice repeated. The duplication, "servant of servants," indicates a very low scale in civil position among the ruling powers of the earth—abject peoples under the rule of alien masters.

8. The civil and religious birthright of Shem made his posterity the great ruling powers of the earth for two thousand years. "Blessed of Jehovah, my God, be Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant."

9. "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem." For two thousand years Japheth has grown in population, possessions and power, and Shem has steadily receded from his former prominence. Japheth has come into the highest and best form of the religious heritage of Shem. "And Canaan shall be his servant."

10. This curse has been fulfilled in the humiliation and enslavement of the Canaanites and cognate peoples; in the degradation of Egypt, the land of Ham, under foreign

domination from early days to the present time; and in the besotted condition of the populations of Africa. And to-day the ruling nations are dividing that continent among themselves with no regard to any rights of its populations.

11. The curse was declared before the disruption of the race, ostensibly at Babel, by which racial types were fixed. The descendants of Ham were remanded to the lowest type in this racial cataclysm. This also may be regarded as part of the curse. Barriers were established which they may not pass.

What sentimentalism shall bridge the chasm and give to Ham a joint heritage with Japheth in the civilizations and the governments of the race? God has declared it an impossibility. Amalgamation, miscegenation, social and civil equality and the proclamation of universal brotherhood have all been foredoomed to failure.

No. 20.

THE SETTLEMENT OF NOAH'S SONS.

Gen. Chap. 10.

The people after the Flood settled along the great rivers just as they did before the Flood. The "Toldoth Beni-Noah"—"the generations of the sons of Noah"—are enumerated in the tenth chapter of Genesis. The names of peoples and nations were derived from persons, and were patronymic, and the persons are named as founders of peoples wherever necessary to the right understanding of the history.

1. The Sons of Shem. They occupied Central and Eastern Asia—the Euphrates, the Tigris and the Indus. They were the Medes, Persians, Assyrians, Syrians and

the Joktanite Arabs and all the sons of Eber—Hebrew peoples—and all their kin. They extended in Moses' day from the upper Euphrates to the Red Sea.

2. The Sons of Ham. They occupied North Africa, Egypt, Ethiopia (Cush) as far south as the Persian Gulf, lapping over into the peninsula of Arabia. They also occupied Crete, Philistia and Canaan.

3. The Sons of Japheth. They spread northward and occupied Lesser Asia, and moved northward and westward into Europe, into the regions which were but slightly open to settlement before the Flood, if Principal Dawson and others are right when they tell us that the glacial period continued in Northern Europe till about four thousand years ago. They embraced all the Greek peoples along the Mediterranean, the Slavs, the Muscovites, the Franks, the Gauls, the Celts, and other peoples in the British Isles. There is some difference of opinion here as to details.

However, we can trace all the peoples named in Gen. 10 with sufficient certainty to verify the statement of verse 32: "These are the families of the Sons of Noah, after their generations in their nations: and by these were the nations divided after the flood."

No. 21.

EARLY MIGRATIONS.

Gen. 10:8–11; 11:31; 12:1–5.

Nimrod, a descendant of Ham through Cush of Ethiopia "began to be a mighty one on the earth," and "a mighty hunter before the Lord." The physical prowess of military heroes was accentuated in early times by hand to hand conflict with ferocious wild beasts. Even

David, already "a mighty man of valor," cited his conflicts with a lion and a bear in order to convince Saul of his ability to cope with the giant.

This Nimrod seemed to have crossed the Persian Gulf and established himself in the plain of Shinar, the very richest of the countries of the Shemites, and his kingdom embraces "Babel, and Erick, and Accad, and Calneh in the land of Shinar." He does not seem to have founded these cities, as is supposed, but he dispossessed the inhabitants of that region as far down as the Persian Gulf, and drove them northward.

The authority for this is in Gen. 10:11, added by the historian: "Out of that land went forth Asshur (the Assyrians) and builded Ninevah, Rehoboth, Calah and Resin." Compare verse 22. The migration of conquered peoples has been no uncommon thing in the history of the races.

Many believe that other migrations took place at that time. One was the removal of the Phoenicians, a maritime people, from the Persian Gulf to the shores of the Mediterranean where they either founded or occupied Tyre and Sidon. The other was the migration of the Hebrews from that same region into Syria and Palestine, where they are now known to have been numerous at an early day.

Terah, who evidently belonged to a great patriarchal line, migrated under divine direction, and stopped with his family in Syria at Haran, among Shemitic peoples. They had migrated from Ur of the Chaldees. Did Terah and his adherents found that city and name it for his son Haran who had died in Chaldea? After fifteen years Abram moved on to Canaan, his original, divinely directed destination.

One more question. Were not the Hyksos, the shep-

herd peoples who dominated Egypt so long, these same Hebrew peoples, afterwards absorbed by other shepherd nations?

No. 22.

THE GENEALOGIES.

Gen. 5:2–32; 10:1–32; 11:10–32; Matt. 1:1–16; Luke 3:23–38.

In patriarchal times it was always a matter of prime importance to preserve family records. Every man must needs be able to locate himself in a proper line of family descent. Family pride dates back to the beginning and is wholesome when not abused.

These records have been preserved in tribes and families, and have been transmitted both in writing and by memory. A most important part of the education of every child was to recite the family tree with pride in his ancestors, and collateral lines were not neglected.

One incidental advantage of this was to exalt and intensify family life. Another was to preserve family history and traditions, which clustered about the names of the fathers. And still another was to stimulate each new generation to imitate the virtues and noble deeds of their fathers. Their ideals were thus transmitted from generation to generation. This may account for the permanent and crystalline character of patriarchal civilization.

On the practical side these genealogies were valuable to preserve and vindicate personal and official rights and franchises. Property rights were determined and regulated thereby. This is true with us to-day, and the mutilation or destruction of family records is a great

misfortune. Ancestor worship is a pagan abuse of the instinct to honor and rejoice in the nobility of the fathers. We may notice some features of the genealogies preserved in the Scriptures.

1. Those in Gen. 5:2–32 give the line from Adam to Noah along the line of the "Sons of God," and through Seth. Those in Gen. 10:1–32; 11:10–32 give the line from Noah to Abraham through Shem.

2. The links from Abraham to David and to the captivity are to be gathered from the history. We find them in tabulated form in the New Testament, evidently copied from recognized public tables which also gather up the links after the captivity until Christ.

3. Links are sometines skipped, and a grandson is counted as a son for good reasons, no doubt. We ascertain this from the history in a few cases. This does not prove that the omissions are numerous as some suppose in order to set up a theory. Theories based on possible, but imaginary facts, are mischievous.

4. The two tables in Genesis furnish us the data for early chronology, as we shall see.

5. The table in Matthew spans the period from Abraham to Christ; the table in Luke, from Adam to Christ in the reverse order, and spans 4,000 years of Bible history. The two part company at David and run on in two lines. Matthew finds Joseph the actual son of David and of Abraham. And Joseph was the legal father of Jesus. Luke finds Heli the end of the race line from Adam through Abraham and David. Who was Heli? Evidently the father of Mary. Joseph was his son-in-law. If this is not true there is no conceivable reason why Luke should copy this table into his Gospel. This view is reinforced by Gabriel's words to Mary, and the trend of subsequent statements.

No. 23.

THE ORIGIN OF LANGUAGE.

It is not sufficient to say that man has the capacity of articulate speech, and that such speech is subject to certain laws just as are all his other powers or capacities.

All infants born into the world start life with a very small modicum of actual powers and capacities, which are unfolded, some slowly, some rapidly, secundum opus. Many of them are assisted by imitation and memory, especially the power of speech, which keeps pace with the growth of the intellect. It is hardly safe to say that language originated in this way.

In comparative philology we find that certain laws or forces have been in operation for ages to modify language more and more as the ages pass. We talk of languages and dialects as closely related, or descended from a common stock. It is, however, not safe to say that all variations in language originated in this way, for this would discredit the story of Babel where the confusion of tongues was of divine origin. There was but one language and one speech before Babel.

It is evident from the opening chapters of Genesis that Adam and Eve used a language commensurate with all their needs and with all the exigencies of their unique condition. This cannot be doubted or disputed. What then was the origin of this language? There can be but two theories. It was either invented by man, or it was divinely communicated.

If it was man-made it certainly was a great triumph of human genius. Look at it. Words and combinations of words are the names of ideas, with all their relations and correlations as seen and expressed in their early history.

Yet philologists have not been wanting to describe the natural evolution of language, starting with one or two vocables—names of things, then of actions, first single, then complex. The difficulties of this scheme increased a thousand fold when they passed into the realm of the abstract ideas and complex truths. However, if man himself is an evolutionary product, there is no reason why his language should not be also.

It would seem more satisfactory to consider language as God-given. If Adam and Eve were created full grown man and woman we cannot suppose that their powers and faculties were infantile, but rather in full grown exercise. If God held personal converse with them he could hardly have waited for them to invent and elaborate a language for him to use in such converse.

Again, if the Lord concerned himself to provide for them coats of skins he would hardly fail to supply their greater needs.

If then language was God-given, we may fairly ask, How? Was it by painstaking and tedious lessons, aided by imitation and memory, but without grammar, lexicon or literature? Hardly.

The only other alternative is that it was given by inspiration. If so, it was the analogue of instinct. No one denies instinct in man and beast—a certain modicum of knowledge directly given and not acquired. We may fairly assume that the newly created pair were endowed with all needful faculties, capacities and powers in full exercise.

The gift of tongues by inspiration at Pentecost and on numerous other occasions, and on great numbers of persons, would indicate that this was the divine method of teaching language.

The story of Babel indicates the same. The elimina-

tion of one language and the substitution of another, by families and tribes, was divinely wrought and was, in its essence, inspiration.

There was one language from the Flood to Babel, transmitted by Noah and his family from antediluvian speech, which was presumably one. Some have argued that the original language, transmitted by Noah, was Hebrew. The argument is that Hebrew is the most scientific of all the languages, showing but little signs of accretion or detritus, while all other ancient tongues were conglomerate, dialectic and degenerate, but pointing back to the Hebrew as the mother tongue.

It has been suggested that a section of the Shemites, the earliest Hebrews (Eber) were a God fearing race and took no part in Babel and so escaped the confusion of tongues, and preserved and transmitted their language uncorrupted. This is a beautiful theory, to say the least of it, and is certainly a plausible speculation.

This speculation was reinforced some years ago by an eminent French philologist, whose name I forget. He maintained that the Hebrew language was the only language of antiquity that maintained its integrity and showed no signs of decay or disturbance or modification from any cause. He maintained that all other languages indicated cataclysms and abnormal conditions and degeneracy, while pointing backward to the scientific features of the Hebrew as the original mother tongue of them all.

He made no effort to account for these facts, and certainly made no reference to the story of Babel, if indeed he had ever read it, for he was not only a skeptic but an atheist.

No. 24.

BABEL.

Gen. 11:1–9.

In the tenth chapter of Genesis we have the "Toldoth Beni-Noah," "The generations of the sons of Noah." In verse 32 we read: "These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations: and by these were the nations divided after the flood."

The question recurs, what forces were at work to disintegrate the race into all these nations as set forth in this tenth chapter? Family ties and family instincts no doubt played a prominent part in giving permanence and fixity to all these nations. The very names are patronymic.

We might expect to find some powerful centrifugal force in operation like some great special and civil cataclysm. Centripetal forces had operated for a long season to hold families and tribes together as one. The sacred historian found it necessary to pause in the very midst of his genealogies and recount the causes and forces at work to rend the race into nations and peoples. Gen. 11:1–9. We quote the entire passage.

"And the whole earth was of one language and speech.

And it came to pass, as they journeyed eastward, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and they dwelt there. And they said one to another, Go to, let us make brick and burn them thoroughly. And they had brick for stone, and slime had they for mortar. And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the earth. And the Lord came down to see the city and the

tower, which the children of men builded. And the Lord said, Behold the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do; and now nothing will be restrained from them which they have imagined to do. Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech. So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth, and they left off to build the city. Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth; and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth."

By a careful analysis of this account we note several facts and principles:

1. The entire race was of one language when they set out to build this city.

2. It was located in the plain of Shinar and Nimrod was presumably the founder. Gen. 10:8–10. The later name was Babylon.

3. Thus early they sought to make the plain of Shinar the seat of universal empire, as was accomplished in a limited and temporary way many centuries later.

4. Community of language was the key to universal sympathy, ambition, and effort, just as it is to-day.

5. The formation of such a gigantic centralization was mischievous to the race and must be defeated at all hazards.

6. Not only so, but the Lord said that if they succeeded in this, their oneness as a people and their oneness of language would make it impossible to restrain them from any evil they might imagine to do.

7. The obvious remedy was the confusion of their language so that they could not understand one another's speech. This the Lord did by supernatural power.

8. This was evidently done along family and tribal lines, for the nations that grew out of the scattered families retained patronymic and family names.

9. The disappointment and the terror of the miracle would seem to have been sufficient to stop the building of the city and to scatter them abroad on the face of the whole earth.

10. But it is further said, "from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad on the face of the whole earth." We know not what further means he used, but we are told that he was there in a peculiar and personal sense.

11. We are warranted in believing that this division into nations with continued divergencies of speech was remedial, and has been conservative, and will be so until the final triumph of the Gospel of Christ.

12. It is strange that scoffers make merry over the story of Babel when it furnishes the only key to a supreme crisis of the race, and when the principles enunciated therein have been elucidated and confirmed in all ages.

No. 25.

ORIGIN OF RACIAL TYPES.

Ethnologists are agreed as to the unity of the human race. They are equally unanimous in classifying man into eight so-called races which differ so sharply from each other that they are regarded as fixed types. No satisfactory account has been given of the origin and the fixity of these eight racial types.

The archæological remains of ancient civilizations reveal the fixity of these races, both in sculptures and paintings. They certainly originated from adequate causes. The Scriptures throw no direct light on their

origin. It is evident that they did not exist in Noah's day. They would seem to be ruled out as long as the race was of one tongue. This was the case when they began to build at Babel. This in turn would indicate their origin within a brief space of time—between Babel and the earliest archæological records.

It has been commonly assumed that these eight varieties of the race originated in climatic conditions, differences of food, modes of living and other environment, which confessedly would require a long period of time. If naturalistic processes did produce these varieties we inquire in vain for the cause of their fixity for the past 4,000 years. This is the problem that evolution wrestles with in vain—much more the Biblical ethnologist.

The felt necessity for a long period of time has made sad havoc of Bible chronology. It either throws Noah and the Flood into a remote antiquity or else it exempts seven of the races from the waters of the Flood. Either of these hypotheses greatly complicates the problem.

Science, so far, has concerned itself with the bodily and physical variations of the eight so-called races, except so far as the spirit seems to be modified thereby. Does this science offer a hypothesis that takes into account all the differentiating features of these races?

The differentiating features are threefold, and all three are co-existent in each race, and are adjusted to each other.

1. Each type has its own physical variations which are so marked, that it has been argued to be impossible for the eight races to have a common birth origin.

2. Each race has its own variations of language, which are easily recognized by the philologist.

3. The third consists of modifications of the spirit, which embraces the heart, mind and soul—the intellec-

tualities, the sensibilities and the moralities of the spirit —which is the real man.

These three are so correlated to each other that they must have had a common origin, and all at the same time. Language is the expression of thought and sensibilities and they must needs vary together—the one objective and the other subjective. In normal conditions the body and the spirit are adjusted to each other and must needs vary together. The three are so logically related that they must have varied together.

These variations are so radical that they lie at the foundation of racial instincts, and the several new types must needs separate themselves from each other in order to self preservation as well as for social and civil comfort.

Babel was the only great epoch of the race after the Flood. Some great cataclysm broke the race into great segments which thenceforth spoke different languages, lived in separate localities, and developed varied civil and social institutions. Why not admit that these segments were the types or races under discussion? The divine causation which confused the tongue and scattered the race did certainly produce all the other results, either miraculously or by providential control. Why not admit that man was modified into separate types at one fell blow?

This hypothesis coheres with all the facts and makes them mutually explanatory. Babel accounts for all or none—such is their logical coherency. Not a single fact of sacred or of secular history militates against this hypothesis or makes it difficult to our faith.

No. 26.

THE SHORTENING OF HUMAN LIFE.

Noah lived to be nine hundred years old. The curse and blight of sin had not yet broken down the iron constitutions of the race, especially in the line of the "Sons of God." Long life among the "Sons of Men" no doubt made giants of iniquity in those days, for "wicked men and seducers wax worse and worse." Still it was no doubt true then as now that "bloody and deceitful men" did not "live out half their days." Ps. 55:23.

After the Flood the term of human life was gradually shortened for good and sufficient reasons. This was doubtless due on the one hand to the deadly virus of sin and its growing degeneracy. On the other hand its gradual accomplishment seems to have been the result of providential causes and forces rather than any miraculous interposition.

Shem lived six hundred years; Arphazad, four hundred and thirty-eight years; Salah, four hundred and thirty-three years; Eber, four hundred and sixty years; Peleg, two hundred and thirty-nine years; Reu, two hundred and thirty years; Nahor, one hundred and forty-eight years; Terah, two hundred and five years; Abraham, one hundred and seventy-five years; Jacob, one hundred and thirty years; Moses, one hundred and twenty years. In David's day the ordinary limit of human life had become fixed at three score years and ten and so it remains to this day, though the average has long been about the half of that limit. "So teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom."

There was a sudden break in the days of Peleg and Joktan of about two hundred years. Why? We may

not dogmatize about it. But we may suggest that this was the period of the Cushite wars under Nimrod, and the disturbances at Babel, and the scattering of the families of the earth, and the consequent hardships and privations of colonial life.

May we not suggest also that this was the period of climatic and sanitary cataclysms which originated and fixed the variations of form, stature, color and race characteristics of the so-called races of men? The names of Peleg and Joktan seem to designate an epoch. "The name of the one was Peleg (division); because in his days was the earth divided; and his brother's name was Joktan (small)." Why not suppose that this was the epoch of racial divisions, and the physical degeneration incident thereunto?

No. 27.

WHO WERE THE HEBREWS?

Eber was a grandson of Shem and many peoples were descended from him. His descendants have been generically called Hebrews, and they represent to this day a definite, crystalline form of civilization. They seem never to have apostatized wholly from the worship of the one true God. They have never been won over to polytheistic idolatry.

His son Joktan left his own name to numerous tribes and peoples who settled in Arabia and spread to Central Asia, and we call them Joktanite Arabs.

Abraham through the line of Peleg was five generations later than Joktan. Four lines were descended from him.

1. The line through Isaac and Jacob were the seed of covenant promise according to the flesh. The name of

Abraham was not perpetuated by them as a patronymic, partly, because he had other lines of descendants, and mainly, because he was made by covenant the father of the faithful—the spiritual father to the end of time. "If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise."

This line seems to have taken the name "Hebrew" by convention, as "The Hebrews." Joseph in Egypt was called "a Hebrew." The name was retained by his people and it is their distinguishing name to this day, and they claim it with pride in preference to the name "Jew."

The other lines from Abraham took their names from their patriarchal heads.

2. The Ishmaelites—descendants of Ishmael, the son of Hagar.

3. The Edomites—descendants of Esau, the son of Isaac.

4. The Bedouin Arabs—a conglomerate of several tribes descendants of the sons of Keturah, among whom the Midianites were the most prominent.

The Edomites were proselyted to Judaism in the days of the Asmonean princes. The Ishmaelites dominated the descendants of Keturah, and they all swear by Abraham, their father to-day.

No. 28.

WHO WAS MELCHIZEDEK?

Gen. 14:17–20; Heb. 6:20; 7:1–28.

There are numerous theories concerning the identity of this mysterious personage, some of which we may notice.

1. The more daring higher critics have remanded him to the region of prehistoric legends and myths. They make him and Abraham the mythical product of early Asiatic thought—mere poetic fiction. The author of Hebrews evidently believed in him as an actual person —the highest type of the great high priest, 7:1–28.

2. Sayce rebuked his brother critics for their destructive theories and vindicates the historicity of the Scripture account of these persons and their times and makes them as creditable as any other "secular" records. He finds Melchizedek to be a priest of the sun-god of the Babylonians—the most high god of that age. And Abraham paid him tithes simply because it was customary. Such a theory makes "The Most High God" of Heb. 7:1 to be the sun god of the Babylonians—a monstrous proposition.

3. Some identify Melchizedek with Shem without a single fact in common except that Shem was alive at this time, according to Usher's chronology; but he had been dead 500 years according to Hales' chronology. Besides, there is no evidence that any ancestor of Terah migrated with him from Ur of the Chaldees.

4. Some have tried to identify him with Job. This would place Job too early by two or three hundred years, as indicated by the names of his four friends.

5. Others identify Melchizedek with the Philistine who, according to Herodotus, conquered Egypt by peaceful methods, and for twenty years was the architect and builder of the Great Pyramid of Cheops, and afterwards returned to his own country and founded Jerusalem. This is certainly a very plausible and fascinating theory.

6. The name Melchizedek was first a title, and then the name of the founder and king of Uru-salem—Jerusalem. This name and title was handed down for several

hundred years as the king of Salem, Jebus, Jerusalem, even to Joshua's conquest. It there appears under the modified form of Adonizedec, "Lord of Righteousness." Josh. 10:1.

7. Paul declares him a priest of the Most High God, of a higher order than the Aaronic priesthood, because of direct divine appointment. Heb. 7:1–28. A letter from the king of Jerusalem to his liege lord, king of Egypt, has been discovered at Tel-el-Amarna, claiming a royal priesthood by divine appointment, in terms substantially identical with Paul's account of Melchizedek.

8. We are now prepared to locate Melchizedek as a great high priest in a world wide hierarchy of divine appointment. Abraham was a family priest sojourning within his jurisdiction and due to pay him tithes. Potipherah, priest of On, Jethro, and Balaam were no doubt priests of the same order, each among his own people. This old hierarchy fell into decay as the centuries passed and apostasy grew, and was superseded by the Aaronic priesthood, with a jurisdiction limited to the people of God, till the Great High Priest himself came and fulfilled all previous types.

No. 29.

ISAAC'S FAITH.

Abraham's faith when told to offer up his son for a burnt offering is emphasized in Gen. 22:1–14, and also in Heb. 11:17–19. He had already been justified by faith and was accounted the father of the faithful. Heb. 11:8–12; Rom. chap. 4. His faith was also submitted to an extreme test. He set out for Mount Moriah with Isaac and two menservants who carried the wood and

the fire. He evidently rode on his ass, for he was getting to be an old man. On the third day they came to the foot of Mount Moriah. There he left the "young men" and the ass. He laid the wood on Isaac, who was no mere lad or half grown boy, as some suppose. He must have been a stalwart young man of perhaps twenty-five years, able to carry a load of wood sufficient to consume a man or a ram on the altar. Abraham carried the fire and a knife, and so they went up the mountain to the plateau on top.

On the way they discussed the question of a sacrificial lamb. We may fairly infer that the young man shared the faith of the father and relied on the same covenant promises, and on the same divine power to solve the apparent contradictions, even to raising him from the dead. We may be sure that the covenant promises were no secret in the hearts of his father and mother, but were also his pride and joy as the son of promise.

His meek acquiescence and submission to be bound and laid on the altar was doubtless easier for him than the task imposed upon the father.

No doubt father and son rejoiced together when the Angel of the Lord (the Lord himself) called from heaven, enough, and provided another victim for the offering. Still greater must have been their faith and joy when the Lord called from heaven again and renewed the covenant, made and ratified again and again before. Then they returned to Beersheba.

One more thought. Did not all this point in prophetic type to the time when God the Father gave his only begotten Son as a whole burnt offering, a sacrifice, a willing sacrifice? Hear him cry, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God."

No. 30.

JACOB AND ESAU.

It has been the fashion to exaggerate the shortcomings of Old Testament saints and even to blacken their reputations and characters. Abraham, Jacob and David have had their full share of denunciations, both in the pulpit and out of it.

We may not condone or put up a plea for any man's sins or shortcomings. Still we may cover them with the mantle of charity, knowing that we ourselves need charitable judgments of our own shortcomings. Charity "thinketh no evil." "Charity covereth a multitude of sins."

Before the twins were born it was foretold that the younger should have the birthright. It was no secret in the family. Time passed and the fulfillment was slow. This begat impatience. The story of the sale and purchase is familiar. The birthright in this case carried with it not only the usual temporal and spiritual headship in the family, but also the succession to the Abrahamic covenant.

Esau's claim to be *in extremis* was evidently a reckless statement. Paul explained it as a profane and reckless undervaluation of supreme values. Moses says, "Thus he despised his birthright." Jacob secured the formal title to what he had long considered his own in reality. It can hardly be said that he took advantage of his brother's starving condition to drive a hard bargain. His mistake was in trying to anticipate the divine purpose.

His mother's scheme to secure for Jacob the father's last blessing was much more aggravated It is to Jacob's credit that he hesitated to go into it and he so argued

against her, but she overruled his objections and his fears.

We need not tell the story, but some things are evident. The birthright and the blessing were two different things. Esau so understood it. Gen. 27:36. The blessing was the inspired blessing of the patriarch—God's prophetic blessing, not man's.

Isaac was deceived, but God was not deceived. Each of the brothers received the same blessing he would have gotten without Rebecca's intervention. She and Jacob accomplished nothing by their trickery in trying to hasten God's purposes. They had waited seventy years. Their reward was a breach in the family, Esau's angry threats, Jacob's flight to Padan-aram, and twenty years of fear before he was reconciled to his brother at the Jabbok.

No. 31.

JACOB AND RACHEL.

Jacob left home to escape his brother's anger, but ostensibly to get a wife of his kindred in Padan-aram. He came to a well in the open country near Haran. Three flocks of sheep were lying around the well and a fourth was seen coming in the distance, led by Laban's daughter Rachel. Those in charge of the other flocks so informed him.

The mouth of the well was covered with a stone. Those in charge were waiting for some one to roll away the stone—the men in charge of the cattle, who were expected later. There seems to have been no man in charge of the sheep, only girls, not women. Dr. J. M. P. Otts, D. D., was a wide awake and discriminating traveler for some months in the East. He reported that

he never saw or heard of a woman in charge of flocks in all his travels. But it is to-day the custom to separate the lambs at weaning time and to put them in charge of little girls while the men (the shepherds) led the main flock to more distant pastures.

These flocks around the well were, no doubt, separated flocks of weaned lambs in charge of little girls—daughters either of the owners or of the shepherds in charge of the main flocks.

When Rachel came up with her flock he promptly rolled away the stone and watered her flock. He then gave her the warm salutation of a near kinsman and wept for joy. During the first month of his sojourn with Laban he became so in love with the little girl that he plighted his troth and agreed to wait seven years till she were of proper age to marry. In the meantime he took charge of Laban's flocks and served him as a loyal son. The seven years "seemed unto him but a few days, for the love he had for her."

This story and the story of Ruth are the two beautiful love stories of the Bible. Moses seems to have had a somewhat similar experience in Midian, though the details are not given.

No. 32.

TEMPORARY INCARNATIONS.

We believe in one permanent incarnation, Jesus Christ, "The Son of God," "Very God and very man," "God manifested in the flesh," "The Word became flesh," "Immanuel," "Christ the Son of God became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul," "Who, being the eternal Son of God, became man, and

so was, and continueth to be, God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever." Such is our faith.

This is a great mystery. So far as we can see, the same divine power that effected this incarnation would have been competent to terminate it. But it was his holy will that the man Christ Jesus should remain our Elder Brother and Redeemer forever.

Men to-day stumble at the doctrine of the incarnation as if it were a lone, isolated case taxing their faith. They fail to see that Jesus Christ is the culminating case, and that incarnations were so numerous from the beginning that they seem to have been the law of the divine administration and the key of all the Theophanies.

The Jews of Christ's day took no exception to the doctrine of incarnation. They were too well versed in the history of God's intercourse with them as a people. They did, however, reject Christ's claim to be their Incarnate Lord and King because he did not fulfill their ambitions and sinful schemes.

The term Theophany includes every mode of manifestation of Deity to man through the natural senses of the human body, so that one person of the Godhead is recognized as personally present. We find four modes of manifestations, to wit:

1. By visible sign or symbol.
2. By spoken words.
3. By visions and dreams.
4. By incarnations.

With a very few exceptions these Theophanies were limited to the LORD, Jehovah, the second person in the Trinity, the revealer, the author and administrator of all the covenants, and whose name occurs 7,000 times in the Old Testament Scriptures.

The few exceptions are found in the New Testament Scriptures.

1. God, the Father, twice spake, and said "This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased"—at his baptism and at the transfiguration. And on the last day of his public ministry he cried out, "Father, glorify thy name." Then came there a voice from heaven, "I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again." Some said it thundered and some said an angel spake to him. But there was no visible manifestation in either case.

2. The Holy Spirit was seen by Jesus and by John, descending from heaven like a dove at his baptism.

At Pentecost the Holy Ghost descended and distributed tongues of fire rested upon the 120 in that upper room.

There is reason to believe that the same thing was repeated while Peter was preaching to Cornelius and his Gentile household and dependents. Compare Acts 10: 44–48; and 15:8. "The Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning." Acts 11:15.

We may now note the four modes of manifestation of the Lord (Jehovah) from the beginning to his permanent incarnation.

1. By visible sign and symbol. We are quite familiar with the burning bush, the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night, the fire and smoke at Mount Sinai, and the Shekinah or cloud on the Mercy seat, beneath the cherubim. It is not pertinent to do more than mention these. But they seem to exhaust this category.

2. By spoken words. We mention a few cases. He spake the ten words from Sinai's top. He talked to Moses in the mount. He talked to Moses from behind the vail of the tabernacle. The oracle, by Urim and

Thummim, afterward came in an audible voice from the same source when solicited by the high priest. He called the child Samuel by night and gave a message to Eli. There were perhaps other cases of this sort, but the divine speaker was not visible to the eye.

3. By visions and dreams, by day and by night. We may mention Jacob's vision at Bethel, his dream directing him to return home. Gen. 31:11–13; also Laban's dream, Gen. 31:24; and Jacob's visions at Beersheba. Gen. 46:1–3. Conspicuous among these is Abraham's vision of a blazing lamp and a burning furnace in ratification of the covenant.

Revelations by visions are determined to be such by direct assertion, or by the context, or by the obvious character of the vision itself, or by all three together. The visions of Daniel, Ezekiel, and John on Patmos, are cases in point.

4. By incarnations, which were temporary, secundum opus, until the last and permanent incarnation, Christ Jesus.

It is proper to note here that there were two kinds of these temporary incarnations, incarnations of Deity, and incarnations of angels.

Critics chide us and deride the Scriptures for "crude and anthropomorphic conceptions of Deity," as if they are not natural and necessary.

There came three men to Abram's tent at Mamre. One was the Lord, the other two were angels. These were also real men. They ate, they slept, they walked, and they talked.

Joshua at Jericho saw a man with a drawn sword in his hand—an armed soldier—"the captain of the Lord's host"—the Lord himself. They conferred together.

The commander-in-chief and his general settled the plan of campaign in a distinctly human way.

We learn from chapter 13 of Judges that "The Man of God" who appeared to Manoah and his wife and promised them a son proved to be none other than the Lord himself to whom, in form a man, they were allowed to offer a burnt offering and a meat offering.

Suffice it to say that here and in numerous places elsewhere "The Angel of the Lord" proves to be the Lord himself in theophanic manifestations.

Now starting with these incarnations we have the key to the current mode of theophanic manifestations from the beginning, until they were superseded by inspired prophets and priestly oracle. The Scriptures were written for the Jewish people and we are entitled to read them from their point of view. It was not necessary to repeat constantly the mode but the context usually suggests the necessary presence and activity of the human element.

Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel held frequent converse with the Lord who walked in the garden in the cool of the evening; he called for them; they hid from his presence; he made them coats of skins; he pronounced the curse on all the parties; he reproved them for sin; he argued the gravest questions in the Cain and Abel controversy. There is no hint here of visions. The human element was obvious and prominent in these manifestations of their divine teacher, judge, and redeemer.

We need not cite the details of the personal contact of the Lord and Noah in constant conference during the period of the Flood. We may not explain it by vision, oracle or inspiration.

In Abraham's history we find such formularies as

these, numerously, "The Lord appeared to Abraham," "The Lord called," etc., etc., with no indication as to the mode. But the theory of temporary incarnations would seem to have the right of way, with no indications to the contrary.

We need not go through all the history down to the time when the theophanies finally gave place to inspiration by the spirit through the prophets. The transition, however, was gradual as in other changes of administration.

Angelic incarnations were equally familiar to the fathers, and were recognized as a matter of course by Zachariah and Mary. Two of the men at Mamre were angels, so also, the two guests of Lot in Sodom. Ofttimes in the history an angel in human form executed his ministrations. At least four angels were seen in connection with the resurrection and two at the ascension. We can but believe that whenever the heavenly hosts were seen they were incarnate, whether seen by Jacob at Mahanaim or by the shepherds who watched their flocks by night.

In short, it is hard to conceive how a pure spirit can reveal himself to human senses except by means of an incarnation.

But may not these all have been visions, not realities; illusions, not true human bodies and souls as well? Some have tried to explain away Christ's actual humanity, body and soul, in this way.

There were visions of the night and of the day as well —Jacob's vision at Bethel, Ezekiel's visions, John's visions on Patmos, and the like. Visions of what? Visions of incarnations. It is well known that dreams and visions appear exactly as if seen through the bodily senses. So visions reinforce our contention instead of explaining it away.

There are some indications that the Devil and his angels had the power of temporary incarnation. But the doctrine of possessions of devils would better define the limits of their power in this direction, to wit: Satan in the serpent, the evil spirit in Saul, the devils in the fierce demoniac and then in the swine.

Satan entered into Judas after he had received the sop. If we should call Judas and Nero and Mirabeau "devils incarnate" few would dispute the aptness of the figure.

This doctrine and practice of temporary incarnations is not propounded as a mere matter of curious speculation and shrewd exegesis, but to show that the incarnation of Christ Jesus was both natural and necessary, and absolutely coherent with the manifestations of himself and his angels from the beginning—then temporary, now permanent.

No. 33.

THE VALLEY OF SALT. LOT'S WIFE.

It is evident that at a remote period the river Jordan emptied into the eastern arm of the Red Sea which extended to meet it along the fissure of the earth that is called Arabah, and Arabia was more peninsular than it is now. The river now discharges its waters into the Dead Sea, whose sunken basin is now far below its original sea level.

The book of Genesis tells us the story of the great volcanic cataclysm which destroyed the vale of Siddim, and the five cities of the plain, leaving nothing but the Dead Sea and desolation.

It is not our purpose to tell the story of the utter destruction from which nothing escaped except Lot and

his two daughters, who were rescued by the two angels whom he entertained unawares. Our sole purpose now is to notice a curious legend and tradition about which there has been a general unbelief in recent times.

There are still on the borders of the Dead Sea some ancient ruins of human habitations, the probable remains of the two cities of Sodom and Gomorrah amid the wildest desolation and incrustations of salt.

On the south corner of the sea there is a mountain of rock salt with rugged cliffs extending back several miles. This is probably part of a great salt formation which once lay underneath the beautiful and fertile plain of the Jordan—the source of the excessive saltness of the Dead Sea and the incrustations around it. The name of this salt mountain is the Arabic for Sodom.

We are told that when the angels had hurried Lot and his family out of Sodom they commanded them not to look back. But Lot's wife disobeyed and looked back "and she became a pillar of salt." It has been generally held that she became a petrified statue that withstood, for a time at least, the fire and the brimstone and meteoric conditions—a lesson to all beholders.

Is this interpretation of the miracle correct? The word rendered "pillar" is often used in the Scriptures, but nowhere means a "statue" unless it be here. It sometimes means a single stone set up as a memorial. But it was more commonly a monument built of stone for a memorial to succeeding generations. Twice it consisted of twelve stones. Once a pillar built of stones was covered with plaster and the memorials were written upon it. Such usage has been world wide and often on a gigantic scale.

This, therefore, was hardly a statue, but a memorial pillar, such as might have been built of the surrounding

petrified rock salt and may have been of gigantic size.

Fifty years ago or more the Unlted States government sent out a scientific exploration corps to the valley of the Jordan and especially to the Dead Sea, under the command of Lieutenant Lynch. He did his work and made his report with exhaustive care and precision.

He found near the water's edge a pillar of fossil salt, forty feet in height, resting on a rounded pedestal fifty or sixty feet above the level of the sea, making a pillar ninety or one hundred feet high.

If this be the sole remaining witness of Sodom's power and grandeur it is a wonderful testimony which volcanic agencies could not shake from its foundations. This is the natural explanation of its existence.

Now this is the legend or tradition. Josephus in his invaluable book of Jewish Antiquities says that the memorial pillar of Lot's wife was standing in his day, and that he had seen it. He evidently reflected the uniform tradition of his time.

Clement, of Rome, says that the pillar was there in his day, "a memorial of the divine displeasure." If the Jews of Christ's day believed this tradition it gave greater force to Christ's words, "Remember Lot's wife."

But it is hard to believe because it is the witness of a recorded miracle. But when we see an obelisk of stone in Egypt we have no difficulty in believing the simple inscription that tells of its origin. Why not allow the Bible solution of this wonderful pillar to have the right of way till we find a better solution of the pillar standing there to-day?

There are far more wonderful memorials in sight—such as the transmission of the Scriptures, the triumphs of the Gospel, and the status of the Jewish people.

These things and many others attest miracles, providence and prophecy, spanning 4,000 years and more. Why may not this pillar bear its testimony through all these ages? We believe the history because the Dead Sea is a permanent witness, why not believe the testimony of the pillar also?

No. 34.

EARLY CHRONOLOGY.

The later Bible chronology has been verified. Hebrew and Assyrian chronology agree from the Fall of Samaria, 722 Before Christ. Monumental data connect Grecian and Eastern chronology. Recorded eclipses verify the chronology of Rome and Herodotus. Earlier chronology is more difficult.

Three great scholars, Usher, Newton and Hales, have worked out systems of chronology which have their names. All three base their calculations on Bible data. Usher and Newton differ only sixteen years from Creation to Christ. Hales' system is nearly 1,400 years longer.

They differ in the early chronology prior to Abraham. Usher and Newton follow the received Hebrew text of the Scriptures. Hales follows the Septuagint translation into Greek, made about 200 years before Christ. Usher's has been accepted universally among Christian nations, subject, however, to two corrections made in recent years.

The attempt is now made to set aside all the early Bible chronology in the interest of the supposed scientific necessity for far longer periods for man on the earth; and also in the interest of crude Egyptian, Babylonian, and Assyrian chronologies. The authors of these last

differ widely among themselves. The sojourn of man on the earth is variously estimated from 17,000 to 300,000 years.

Such chronologies do not claim a Biblical basis. On the contrary they deny any Bible basis for chronology. Are they right? Were Usher and Newton and Hales and the entire Christian world wrong in supposing that the Bible furnishes the data for a chronology from the Creation to Abraham?

The two genealogical tables seem to furnish a ready answer to this question—one from Adam to Noah, Gen. 5:2–32; the other from the Flood to Abraham, Gen. 11:10–32.

The first covers 1,656 years. The count is made in this way. Adam was one hundred and thirty years old when he begat Seth, his son and successor. Seth was one hundred and five years old and begat his son and successor, Enos. Enos lived ninety years and begat Cainan, and so on down to the birth of Noah. The Flood ended when he was six hundred years old. Add all these amounts together and we have 1,656 years.

The second covers 352 years. The count is made in the same way as above. Arphaxad was born two years after the Flood. Arphaxad lived thirty-five years and begat his son and successor, Salah. And Salah thirty years and begat Eber and so on down to Abraham. These amounts added together make 352 years.

These data certainly make a definite chronology and cover the entire period from the Creation to the birth of Abraham. It is difficult to imagine a better way to give the data for a definite and accurate chronology. Of course, this argument is of no force if these tables are not genuine and authentic. Usher and Newton followed these data as given in the present Hebrew text.

Hales followed the parallel data as found in the Septuagint and added 606 years to the period before the Flood, making 2,262 years; and he added 720 years to the period from the Flood to Abraham, making 1,072 years. The tendency among scholars now is to accept the Septuagint as a competent witness to the state of the Hebrew text when the translation was made. Besides, Luke's genealogy is taken from the Septuagint and contains one name after the Flood—Cainan—which has doubtless been lost from the Hebrew text.

No. 35.

LATER CHRONOLOGY.

Usher, Newton and Hales agree substantially in the chronology from Abraham to the fall of Samaria, 722 B. C. They all adopt the commencement of the temple in the fourth year of Solomon as a fixed date, 480 years from the Exodus. 1 Kings 6:1. More recent calculations indicate that it ought to be 580 or 581, and that the text has been corrupted in the transmission for 3,000 years, as is the case with numbers in a few other places.

It is now conceded that Usher's chronology needs to be corrected by adding 101 years at this point. The calculations are made as follows:

Sojourn in the wilderness.....	40 years.
Joshua's wars of conquest.....	7 years.
Period of the Judges to Samuel the prophet, Acts 13:20.....	450 years.
Samuel and Saul.....	40 years.
David's reign.....	40 years.
Solomon, 4th year.....	4 years.
Total.....	581 years.

We may verify the period of the judges as follows: The period of the judges runs from the division of the land to Samuel, the prophet. Acts 13:20. Joshua died at 110 years old. Assuming that he was about the same age as Caleb, he lived twenty-three years after the division of the land.

Then there was an interregnal space between Joshua and the first judge which can only be estimated. This we discover from Judges 2:7–16. "They served the Lord all the days of Joshua and all the days of the elders that outlived Joshua, who had seen all the great works of the Lord." These elders were materially younger than Joshua because they were all less than twenty years old at Mount Sinai. We may readily allow twelve or fifteen years here.

Then there arose another generation which knew not the Lord and served Baal and Ashtaroth, and the Lord delivered them into the hands of their enemies. These changes must occupy twelve or fifteen years more—the two together making twenty-five or thirty years. Then add the twenty-three years above noted and we shall have about fifty years from the division of the land till the first judge.

Now take all the chronological data from Othniel to Samson, inclusive, and add them all together and we have 409 years. Now add fifty-one years for the period estimated above and we have the 450 years of Paul as cited from Acts 13:20.

It is not necessary here to discuss the small error of about four years in the exact date of the Christian era.

Further scholarship may yet discover other errors in the computations of Usher. Some are trying to recount the years of the sojourn in Egypt, and of the periods of the judges in the interest of an unstable chronology

drawn from archaeological discoveries. Some slight modifications may be adopted, but we may be sure that there are no data in sight which would justify a longer chronology than Hales has constructed from Septuagint data, small errors and omissions excepted.

No. 36.

THE BATTLE OF THE GODS.

Polytheism has deified nature in all its manifestations and forces, from the smallest insects up to the sun, moon and stars. Things beneficent, such as soil, crops, rivers, light, and all pleasures, have been deified. And all things malignant, such as wars, storms, serpents, diseases, famine and pestilence have been worshipped in mortal dread and fear. There are said to be 30,000 gods in the Indian Pantheon, and we now know that the gods of Egypt were very numerous, some beneficent and some malignant.

Every country has had its tutelary divinities on whose benign protection they relied. These personified deities fought their battles, protected their persons and homes, and parried the malignity of the forces of evil.

Homer represents the gods of Greece and Troy as fighting in the upper air while Ulysses and Priam were fighting on the plains of Troy. In the Scriptures we find Jehovah accepting the gage of battle thrown down by surrounding nations in the name of their gods.

Pharaoh threw down the gage of battle when, backed by the pantheon of Egypt, he said, "Who is the Lord that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go." Moses and Aaron took it up, backed by Jehovah, who said, "Against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment. I am

the Lord." Some forty years later Moses reviewed the matter and said, "Upon their gods also the Lord executed judgments," and their adherents were ground to powder. The battle between monotheism and polytheism was fought to a finish, never to be renewed on so grand a scale. This was one of the decisive battles of the world. Waterloo can never be fought over again.

In reviewing the history from the burning bush to the death of the first-born, we may note several things in brief.

1. The Lord gave Moses his commission and confirmed his weak faith by two miracles, and bade him to add still another to confirm the faith of his people. Ex. chapters 3 and 4.

2. At the same time he told Moses how he would smite Egypt. Ex. 3:19, 20; 4:21–23. He bade him to forewarn Pharaoh also.

3. The three miracles were probably symbolic as well as confirmatory, though we may not dogmatize about it.

The serpent, the asp, was Pharaoh's favorite symbol of power, and an asp was interwoven in the royal crown. The miracle of the serpent rod may have symbolized the Lord's control over all the deadly power of Egypt.

The miracle of the leprous hand may have symbolized the Lord's ability and promise to overcome all seeming impossibilities for his people.

The water turned to blood upon the ground may have symbolized the deadly character and results of the impending conflict.

4. When Pharaoh called for a miracle to attest their claims, Moses and Aaron repeated the miracle of the serpent rod. Its effect was parried by the jugglery of the magicians. Then began the conflict which resulted in their utter undoing.

5. Then came the ten plagues, "wonders in the field of Zoan," extending over nine months, from June to March. The first nine attacked and overthrew the most prominent gods in their pantheon with much damage, loss and suffering.

Each god overthrown was made malignant and their judgments were expended on Pharaoh and his people. Each plague was a reign of terror. Their malignant gods, such as locusts, mosquitoes, and storm, were turned loose upon them to do their worst.

Of their beneficent gods, the putrid river and the frogs, living and dead, filled them with utter loathing and disgust; the beetle, the god of procreation, was so multiplied they could not endure it; their cattle perished. The soil was robbed of its products; and the sun shrouded their worship in darkness.

6. Surely, this was enough. No. Their hierarchy was then swept away and their social order was subverted by the death of the first-born in every house. No wonder the hurried order was issued for Israel to begone lest they all perish; and the people hurried them away, loading them with every gift their hearts desired.

7. We may also count the eleventh plague, the great overthrow of the Red Sea when 250,000 worshippers of their gods perished, the very bone and sinew, and the very flower of Egypt.

8. The avowed lessons were that Israel might know, that Egypt might know, and that the nations might know that "I am Jehovah." The lesson was kept fresh by constant rehearsal in Israel, and the Amorites had no heart in them to fight Israel forty years after, because they remembered it. These things were not done in a corner. Woe betide the man "That stretcheth out his hand against God, that strengtheneth

himself against the Almighty. He runneth upon him with a stiff neck, upon the thick bosses of his bucklers."

No. 37.

EGYPT'S OVERTHROW.

About one hundred years before the Exodus the Shepherd Kings, or Hyksos, who had ruled Egypt so long, were driven out and the dynasty that "knew not Joseph" ruled in Egypt. The Hebrews were regarded as enemies because of their loyalty to their former rulers, and because of their purpose to leave Egypt and take possession of Palestine, as was covenanted to Abraham. Ex. 1:10–22.

The king said let us deal wisely with them, lest they multiply. The hard bondage was intended to break their spirit and check their growth, but it failed. Then he ordered every new-born male to be destroyed or cast into the Nile. His evident purpose was to marry the females to the Egyptians and thus break down the solidarity of the Hebrews, and assimilate them into the Egyptian populations. This was partially successful, for the "mixed multitude" cast in their lot with the Hebrews when they left Egypt.

It is not our purpose here to recount the "battle of the gods" on the plain of Zoan for a year—Jehovah, Moses and Aaron on one side, and Pharaoh Jannes and Jambres and all the gods of Egypt on the other. This was the most gigantic struggle of the ages. Monotheism against polytheism, fought out to a finish.

All history is biographical. All the events of Egypt's history at this time cluster about the name of Rameses II, the Pharaoh of the Exodus, because of his official

position and his larger responsibility. But the Scriptures constantly speak of him and his kingdom, his land, his hosts, his people, as all sharing an undivided responsibility and an undivided overthrow—an appalling overthrow.

The Lord tells him that he might have smitten him and his people with pestilence and cut them off from the earth, but he had other plans for glorifying his name through all the earth. Ex. 9:15, 16; compare Rom. 9:17.

We only propose to sketch the extent of the overthrow of Egypt.

1. The first nine plagues wrought great havoc except in Goshen where the Hebrews lived. Passing over the personal discomforts from the frogs, lice, flies, boils and blains, we may cite the destruction of their flocks and herds and crops by hail, murrain, and locusts, threatening gaunt famine.

2. The tenth plague. "At midnight there was a great cry in Egypt, such as there was none like it, nor shall be like it any more." One dead in every house. The Lord smote all the first-born in Egypt from the palace to the dungeon. One-fifth or one-fourth of the population lay dead. Their entire social fabric lay in ruins, and their religious hierarchy was swept away. We need not dwell upon it.

3. The Egyptians pressed eagerly upon the departing Hebrews large wealth of jewels, silver and gold, and raiment and whatever else they desired. Their liberality was so large, and they stripped themselves so completely that it was as if they were "spoiled" by a plundering army. This great portable wealth supplied the Hebrews the means needed for building the tabernacle and its furniture, and also for buying necessaries from surrounding peoples for forty years.

4. When the Hebrews set out Egypt suffered an economic disaster from which she could not recover for fifty years. She lost an industrial population of two millions, or more likely, two and a half millions, with their flocks and herds and other wealth. They had occupied and cultivated the finest lands in Egypt, if not in the world.

5. One disaster more, born of supreme folly, and Egypt's overthrow is complete. There are three natural highways out of Egypt northward. The "Way of the Philistines" lay along the Mediterranean Sea. The "Way of Shur" passed between the bitter lakes on the isthmus and lay across the desert, landing at Hebron. The "Way of the Sea" started at the Red Sea, touched the Ailanitic Gulf at Ezion Gaber and swept around Edom and Moab and passed northward parallel to the plain of the Jordan.

The Hebrews were not allowed to take either of the short roads to Palestine because they were not yet prepared for war and conquest. Setting out from Goshen (Rameses) they rendezvoused at Succoth where they were organized in military array, six hundred thousand strong, partly for drill and partly to facilitate the march.

Setting out from Succoth they moved across the Isthmus parallel to the great garrisoned wall of Egypt till they reached the sea road. All this occupied from four to six weeks (half the time from Succoth to Sinai). Two and a half millions of people, with their impediments of women and children, flocks and herds, and household goods, must needs move very slowly, though well organized.

In the meantime Pharaoh and his people recovered from their panic. They attributed the delays in leaving Egypt to imcompetent and purposeless leadership, and they determined to bring them back with a strong arm.

He gathered his armies and pursued after them—six hundred chosen chariots and all the chariots of Egypt and their captains, his horsemen, fifty thousand, according to Josephus, and his infantry or "host," two hundred thousand according to the same authority. This seemed to be the available military strength of Egypt.

The story is familiar, the utter annihilation of the chariots and horsemen and all the host. Ex. 14:26–28; 15:1–4. This was the completion of Egypt's overthrow, from which she did not recover in half a century.

Pharaoh did not perish, as was once thought, but remained for some years the ignoble and discredited king of a kingdom so broken and base that they dare not disturb Israel, who lay for forty years on their very borders in the desert. Moses says, at the close of the forty years: "The Lord hath destroyed them unto this day."

It is not our purpose here to discuss the discovery of the body of this Pharaoh in recent years, nor to vindicate the exegesis which effectually sets aside the opinion that he perished in the sea. However, it may not be amiss to assign a probable reason for his escape.

It has never been customary for kings and commanders-in-chief to march at the head of moving armies, by day or by night, except sometimes in battle, and even then only because they were needed to inspire confidence and determine the desperate scale of battle. It was rather the custom for them to establish headquarters from which they directed the movements of their troops, usually in the rear.

There was here no battle and it was night. The Hebrews were in motion by the light of the pillar of fire, while the Egyptians were feeling their way along in the pitch darkness from the pillar of cloud on their side.

The king was, no doubt, at headquarters, awake or asleep, expecting victory on the morrow.

It would not be difficult to show how the divine purpose in raising up Pharaoh and his people, as announced by Moses and quoted by Paul, was best promoted by leaving him as a great object lesson, the discredited head of a blasted and discredited people. "For he stretched out his hand against God, and strengthened himself against the Almighty. He ran upon him, even on his neck, upon the thick bosses of his bucklers."

No. 38.

THE WALL OF EGYPT.

It was the custom among the ancients to protect countries as well as cities with walls, either of brick or stone. The most notable and permanent of these is the great Chinese wall. The object of these walls was to protect the borders of the country from traditional enemies. They were usually flanked with towers for watchmen and were garrisoned at important points. It is now well established that there were several such walls in and about Egypt. Several inside of Egypt separated and defended minor kingdoms from each other during those periods when there was no centralized government.

The most important of these walls extended across the Isthmus on the border of Egypt, from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean, parallel to the present Suez Canal. It lay along the line of the bitter lakes which on the Egyptian side greatly reinforced the defensive power of the walls. Besides the towers for watchmen there were migdols, or tall watch towers at several points from which all comers might be seen a great distance across the desert.

This wall had three important gates just where the three great natural highways left Egypt—the "Way of the Philistines," the "Way of the Wilderness" (Shur), and the "Way of the Sea" (the Red Sea). These gates were heavily garrisoned, and at each one of them were large camping grounds and wells of water for armies and caravans. A migdol (a watch tower) and pihiharoth (wells of water) are both mentioned at the camping grounds near the Red Sea.

This wall is very briefly alluded to in Genesis by the names Etham and Shur. Both words mean wall, one Egyptian and the other Hebrew. The desert there lapped over into Egypt and is called the desert of Etham or the desert of the wall. The outside desert is called Shur (the wall), and the road is called also the "way of the wilderness" (of Shur, the wall). The strip across the sea is once called Etham.

These facts are set up incontestably by Dr. H. Clay Trumbull in his "Kadesh-barnea," a book of great research, in which he quotes over four hundred authorities, besides his own personal observations.

In view of these facts it is easy to discover where and how, and why it was necessary for the Hebrews to cross the Red Sea—a divine deliverance. They were hemmed in on every side—the sea in front, the mountain on their right, the wall and its well guarded gate on their left, and Pharaoh's hosts on their rear. Except to the eye of faith (Heb. 11:29), there remained nothing but slaughter or a shameful surrender on the morrow. "Man's extremity is God's opportunity."

No. 39.

THE WATER SUPPLY IN THE DESERT.

When the Hebrews rendezvoused at Succoth, the camping grounds at the middle gate of the wall of Egypt, and then marched along in the desert of Etham inside the wall to the Red Sea, occupying at least five or six weeks, it becomes a question of their water supply. They were too far from the river Nile, and the wells in that desert would seem to furnish an inadequate supply for two and a half millions of people.

The answer is now easy, for it is still easy to trace the remains of a great irrigation canal, about sixty miles long connecting an immense reservoir of water with the Nile, parallel with the route of the Hebrews and not far away. I have seen it stated that the engineers now working in Egypt have it in mind to repair this reservoir and reopen this canal for irrigation purposes.

On leaving this supply behind them no doubt they carried a supply with them in their water bottles or sacks made of skins, just as caravans and travelers do to-day, to supply them from one oasis to another.

After they crossed the sea and turned from the great highway toward Sinai, parallel to the sea, they marched three days in the desert of Etham to Marah, an oasis of brackish water, which was divinely cured. From there they came to Elim, where there were "twelve fountains of water.

The supply taken here lasted them till they reached the Wilderness of Sin, when they found themselves suffering for water, and they murmured bitterly; and that camp was called Rephidim—the murmurers. Moses struck the rock as God commanded and there came a copious supply of water. This place has not been

located, but it was very near the Sinaitic group, for the Lord said "I will stand on the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock." This was probably a theophany visible to all the people.

This "rock in Horeb" gave their water supply during their year's sojourn in Horeb, for there was no other source of supply. Moreover, the Jews have a tradition that this water followed them in the wilderness in living streams wherever needed. Paul seems to refer to this rock and its water as a type of Christ who was then their leader and benefactor. "They did all eat the same spiritual meat," typified by the manna. "And they did all drink the same spiritual drink," typified by the water; "for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed then; and that Rock was Christ." 1 Cor. 10:3, 4.

Some years ago a traveler, whose name escapes me, claimed to have found along the route of the Hebrews abundant evidence of the bed of an ancient stream. This has not been verified. It is supposed that he located their route along the Arabah, as others have done, locating Kadesh-barnea just south of the Dead Sea. There are pools of water here and there in the Arabah. But they are in no way connected with the water of Rephidim.

We do not know the sources of the water supply during their thirty-eight years of sojourn in the wilderness except this. There was then and there is to-day a considerable population in the wilderness and desert of Arabia, having towns and cities. They subsisted on the products of numerous oases which are mostly out of the usual and safe routes of travel. Manna was the daily food of the Hebrews, except what they purchased from the people around them, and there are indications that

they sometimes paid for water as they offered to do if allowed to pass through Edom.

At the final rendezvous at Kadesh-barnea, the congregation (their legislative assembly of five or six hundred) complained that there was not a sufficiency in that oasis for their flocks. Moses was angered and sinned in striking the rock. But an abundant supply was given. Dr. Trumbull tells us that there are two fountains there. He argues with great plausibility that the larger one which springs out of a wall of rock is the fountain started when the rock was broken on that day.

There is one more case of God-given water on the borders of the Amorites—at Beer—when God said to Moses, "Gather the people together and I will give them water."

Several centuries later the enemies of Judah and Israel, warring against Moab, were saved from perishing by a miraculous supply of water. 2 Kings 3:16–20.

We may fairly argue from these four cases of a miraculous supply of water, that God, who furnished them with bread every day for forty years, provided water whenever it was needed.

This discussion is not complete unless we make mention of natural supplies of water during the fortieth year during which they moved from Kadesh-barnea to the plains of Moab and made conquest of Amorites, Bashanites and Midianites. They moved down the west side of the Arabah, which furnished water at intervals, till they struck the "Way of the Sea" or the sea road, at Elath and Ezion Gaber. Following this great natural highway they soon struck and crossed the river Arnon, and the brook Zered, and then the Jabbok and the Jordan and enjoyed the water supplies of the nations they conquered.

All these facts make the thirty-fifth chapter of Isaiah easy to our faith: "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose." "In the wilderness shall waters break out and the streams in the desert. And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water." The entire chapter is Messianic prophecy under various figures.

No. 40.

APOSTASIES.

The word apostasy is not in the Bible, nor is the word apostate there. But they have long been in use because they so aptly express ideas that are found numerously in the Scriptures. Apostasy means "departure," departure from God. An apostate has departed from God.

At a glance we recognize apostasies in conduct, in doctrine, in worship, in faith and in love. It is our purpose to trace and define briefly the mode, measure, limits, nature and extent of the various apostasies mentioned in the Scriptures, as far as may be.

The first apostasy began with Cain. He went out from the presence of the Lord. It started with a departure from sound doctrine—a rejection of the atonement. He and his posterity built up a godless aesthetic and material civilization. There is no evidence of polytheism before the Flood, but theirs was an apostasy of sin and wickedness, and was well-nigh total.

This was the first and probably the last great apostasy to set aside absolutely the claims of morality and righteousness. The waters of the Flood drowned it out. This apostasy grew slowly unto its final culmination,

and it swept the "Sons of God" along with the "Sons of Men" into the same destruction. None escaped but Noah and his family.

After the Flood the race started again under favorable conditions. We do not know how soon nor how rapidly, nor in what precise form and order the next great apostasy set in. We have the scantiest history of the several centuries from Noah to Abraham, except what is found in the genealogies.

We find that idolatry and polytheism had made considerable headway in Abraham's day—so much so that it became necessary to devise a covenant and to raise up a people to receive the oracles of God, under a divine administration, against the time of a general apostasy.

Although it has been persistently taught that the apostasy was complete and paganism universal in Abraham's day, and that Abraham and his immediate family and successors were half reformed pagans, we believe that the Scriptures teach the contrary.

Job and his friends were no pagans, locate them as you will. Nahor, Rebecca and Laban were not pagans. It were a slander to call Melchizedek an apostate and a pagan. Abimelek sware by the God of Abraham. The "fear of the Lord" was on the throne of Gerar and Egypt.

Four hundred years later the apostasy had progressed very far but was not by any means total. We need only cite Potipherah, priest of On, Jethro, priest of Midian, and Balaam of Mesopotamia and their constituencies. Later still, Hiram, King of Tyre and the Queen of Sheba seem to have been as orthodox as David and Solomon.

Organized pagan religions were not born in a day, but were the product of centuries of apostatizing. The oldest apostate cult was probably Sabianism. The heavenly

bodies were considered the dwelling places of several and then numerous gods, and were worshipped accordingly. This cult had no idols, nor sacrifices. It grew in Egypt into the deification of all nature.

The worship of Baal, Astarte, and Ashtaroth, an offshoot of Sabianism, finally superseded it, with its idols and licentious ritual, and was generally adopted under various names and modifications.

In the course of centuries all nations and peoples had their "Gods many and their Lords many," and their religions crystallized into permanent forms, all of which we classify under one generic name, paganism.

Magianism as reformed by Zoroaster was a powerful reaction against polytheism, under Jewish influence, and stood for monotheism and a high morality.

In India the pendulum swung the other way and developed their pantheon of 30,000 gods. Magianism, though very powerful, was finally driven from the field, while Brahaminism, with its subdivisions, now prevails over two-thirds of the human race.

One feature of the prominent and permanent pagan religions needs to be noticed. They have all had a conservative moral system. They have put honor on the family and cultivated the sturdy, manly and heroic virtues, with an anchorage of fear, and faith in their gods. Paul's picture of paganism in the Roman Empire, found in the first chapter of Romans, became possible because their numerous false religions, tolerated and upheld in the Empire, had become effete. Faith had become skepticism. Their anchor was lost, and there was nothing to hold them to their moorings. Nothing saved the populations from reenacting antediluvian apostasy but the salt of Judaism on the one hand, and the Roman civil law on the other.

This effete paganism was part of the necessary preparation for the coming of Christ, in the "fullness of time." So again to-day. The great modern missionary movement has come when the hoary paganism of the East has become effete. Their fear, their faith, and their morality are all failing together, and the populations have nothing to hope for.

Nor is it our purpose to do more than name the great Papal apostasy from which the reformation saved Christianity for a time, at least.

When we look back into Jewish history we find two politico-religious parties, the orthodox and the apostate. We may not trace their fortunes here except to say that the apostate party was exterminated at and during the captivity.

Later on, the Pharisees and the Sadducees were rival apostate parties inside the church. The one was Epicurean materialism. The other, Phariseeism, subverted all sound doctrine and practice, and made the law of God of no effect, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. They set aside their Bibles in the interest of their traditions.

There is another and a similar apostasy in the church to-day, called the Higher Criticism. They set aside the old Bible—all the supernatural agencies and activities recorded therein, and also its genuineness, authenticity and historicity—all in the interest of naturalistic and evolutionary processes. It sets aside all creeds based on the Scriptures and offers us a new theology—new in its facts and conclusions. Woe betide the "Scholarship" that rejects their dogmatic proclamations.

We may not close without adding that the topic of this paper has for individuals the profoundest interest—Apostasy—Departure from God. No wonder Paul says:

"Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God. But exhort one another daily, while it is called To-day; lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin." Heb. 3:12, 13.

No. 41.

AMALEK'S CURSE.

The Amalekites are first mentioned in Abraham's day, when Cherdolaomer and his confederates conquered a long list of nations and swept around to En Mishpat and attacked the cities of the plain on the west through the pass of En-gedi. They dwelt for centuries in the upper part of the wilderness and south of Beersheba. They were closely affiliated with the Midianites later on.

While the Israelites were encamped at Rephidim, near Mount Sinai, the Amalekites made a furious and unprovoked attack upon them. The battle raged with varying fortunes all day until at last Joshua prevailed.

Then the Lord sware, and commanded Moses to write it in a book, that he would have "war with Amalek from generation to generation," for said he, "I will blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven."

A year later than this, Israel received the report of the spies at Kadesh-barnea and were sentenced to abide forty years in the wilderness. But they rashly determined to enter Palestine at all hazards by way of the Azizemeh pass in which the Amalekites and Canaanites were intrenched, watching the movements of Israel. The result was great disaster, because the Lord went not with them and they were not commissioned to execute the curse.

Thirty-nine years later, Balaam, in his prophecy of

the fate of the nations around, said: "Amalek, the first of the nations; but his latter end shall be that he perish forever." Numb. 24:20.

Moses, just before his death, gave his people a solemn charge, "Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way when ye were come out of Egypt." "Thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; thou shalt not forget it." Deut. 25:17–19.

We next hear of Amalek in the song of Deborah and Barak in terms that indicate disaster. Judges 5:14.

The land then had rest for forty years, and when the "children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord," the Midianites, Amalekites and the children of the East oppressed them seven years, like grasshoppers for multitude, and swept the land almost clean of all sustenance. Judges 6:1–6. We need not here recite the story of their overthrow at the hands of Gideon and his three hundred, with their lamps and their pitchers and their trumpets.

In Psalm 83:5–8, Amalek is mentioned as confederate with eight other nations, against Israel and against God. Internal evidence indicates that this happened about the close of the period of the Judges, or at the beginning of the kingdom.

If this be true we see the reason why Saul was directed to execute the curse against Amalek at that time and by extermination. His failure to obey perfectly cost him his kingdom and his life also, and left unbroken the confederacy as a heritage to his successor, with untold disaster to his people. 1 Sam. chap. 15.

"When David and his adherents fled from Saul to Achish, king of Gath, he gave him the city of Ziklag to occupy. While there he made an expedition against the Amalekites and others to the south and inflicted

a great disaster. He took their spoil and "saved neither man nor woman alive to bring tidings to Gath," for the Amalekites were confederate with the Philistines. 1 Sam. 27:8–12.

While the Philistines were warring against Saul on Gilboa and David and his men occupied a position of armed neutrality, the Amalekites came up from the south, plundered the borders of Judah, burnt Ziklag, David's city, and carried off their families and their spoil.

David returned with all speed and pursued after them into their own country. He surprised their army "eating, drinking, dancing." He smote them for twenty-four hours and not a man escaped "save four hundred young men, which rode upon camels and fled." He recovered all the captives and the spoils, and also the spoil of the Amalekites. 1 Sam. 30:1–20.

One disaster more and Amalek ceased to be a people. Seemingly in the days of King Hezekiah, five hundred men, sons of Simeon, went to Mount Seir under three captains, "And they smote the rest of the Amalekites that were escaped, and dwelt there." 1 Chron. 4:42, 43.

Once more. In the days of Ahasuerus, one Haman, an Amalekite, a descendant of King Agag, a traditional enemy of the Jews, and prime minister of the king, planned the destruction of all the Jews in the 120 provinces of the kingdom. But he was outwitted by the beautiful Jewess that lay on the king's bosom. This last of the Amalekites was hanged on the gallows that he had erected in the court of his own house for Mordecai, the Jew.

"The mills of the gods grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly small."

No. 42.

ISRAEL—A COMPOSITE PEOPLE.

There is a general impression that the people Israel, called also Hebrews and Jews, laid great stress on purity of blood. This impression has grown out of three things. (1) The carefulness of Abraham and Isaac in getting wives for the sons of promise from their kin in Padan-Aram. (2) Their carefully kept genealogical tables. (3) The prohibition to intermarry with the seven condemned nations.

Of these (1) and (3) evidently safeguarded their families from the contaminations of idolatry and heathenism; and (2) only kept a permanent record of facts and makes no mention of purity of blood, but often the contrary. We may sum up the facts that support our contention, and we shall see that they were and are a composite people, and that purity of blood played a very inconspicuous part, if any, in their growth and development as a people. Purity of blood was safeguarded for the priesthood only.

1. Abraham himself was a cosmopolite, equally at home in Chaldea, Syria, Palestine, Gerar and Egypt. The covenant to make of him and his seed a countless people had two aspects—one, the visible organized church—the other, the invisible kingdom of believers with Christ at the head. "If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." Abraham was the father of both in a true and proper sense. But there is no hint of pure blood transmitted.

2. Abraham was rich in man servants and maid servants, slaves born in his house and bought with money in his sojournings from Chaldea to Egypt, and of varied nationalities; generally estimated at 1,500 or 2,000.

Isaac and Jacob inherited the most of these, besides those acquired on their own account. These were carried down to Egypt, a part of their personal wealth. These all were made parties to the Abrahamic covenant by circumcision, and were manumitted and assimilated in due season.

3. The "mixed multitude" that followed the Hebrews out of Egypt were the product of intermarriages of Hebrews and Egyptians and their children during one hundred years of the oppression. These were in position to be assimilated by either party. A large part of the murmurings and rebellions originated with these for obvious reasons. These are roughly estimated at half a million. These were all assimilated except those who perished in the wilderness along with the Hebrews proper from twenty years old and upward.

4. The Sinaitic code allowed and encouraged the purchase of foreign slaves as a heritage for their children. Levit. 25:44–46. The same code regulated the manumission of female slaves and their marriage into the families of their owners. Ex. 21:7–11; Deut. 21:10–14.

5. The same code defines the laws of war. Deut. chap. 20. Under certain conditions they slew all the males and took the women and female children along with the spoil. Deut. 20:10–15. These were finally assimilated. We have one case of this sort recounted with great minuteness of detail—in Moses'-Midianite wars. Numb. chap. 31. It seems that they "slew all the men," and saved all the women and their little ones along with the spoil of their cities which they burned. Moses promulgated an order to slay all the females except those that had not known a man. There were 32,000 of these who were distributed by the same rules

and ratios as the other spoils of the war. These were assimilated.

6. The Gibeonites and their towns were made hewers of wood and drawers of water for the tabernacle and were finally assimilated, after the Tabernacle gave place to the temple.

7. After the command to exterminate the seven condemned nations was withdrawn, the remnants remained from Dan to Beersheba to vex and chasten the tribes for their sins throughout the period of the Judges. David put them all under tribute and Solomon drafted 250,000 of their able-bodied men to labor on his public works. The assimilation had already begun in David's day as suggested by the Hittites, Cherethites and Pelethites, on whose devotion he relied with implicit confidence—the devotion of proselytes. All those minor peoples, including the Philistines, Gezerites and Geshurites, seem to have disappeared early in the kingdom by absorption.

During the captivity the Edomites, themselves a composite people, took possession of the southern part of Judah and the name Idumea was given to it. No effort was made to dispossess them. They were proselyted later on and became an integral part of the Jewish people during the Maccabeean period, when they seem to have been proselyted by the sword. The remnants of Moab and Ammon seem to have been proselyted in the same way.

We may not omit a last and notable case. When Ahasuerus was king from India to Ethiopia, Mordecai, the Jew, sat in the king's gate and Haman was prime minister. When Haman's infamous plot to destroy all the Jews in the kingdom failed and he was hanged on his own gallows, Mordecai was promoted next to the king, "and many of the people of the land became Jews;

for the fear of the Jews fell upon them." Esther 8:17; 9:27.

9. From the captivity to Christ the Synagogue was the great and constant agent for proselytism from the heathen world. Great numbers of men and women took refuge in the Jewish Synagogue from a waning paganism—Proselytes of Justice and Proselytes of the Gate. The former received the rites of baptism and circumcision and became Jews. The latter adopted their moral code and waited for the "Hope of Israel." These were the "devout men and women" of whom we read in the New Testament. This Jewish proselytism was so deep rooted and universal in all their history that even the Pharisees would compass sea and land to make one proselyte. Talk about Jewish exclusiveness, why, the doors of Judaism were as wide open as the doors of Christianity.

10. It is not out of place to note here that we find in the genealogy of Christ the names of Tamar, a Canaanite, and Rahab, an Amorite, and Ruth, a Moabite, and Bathsheba, a Hittite. We do not know how many more Gentile mothers there may have been equally entitled to a place in this table. We would not have known of these four if they had not been prominent in certain incidents in the history.

11. The constant reception and assimilation of people of all nations and of all religions gave a continuous fulfillment of the covenant of promise, made to Abraham, of universal blessing, in part at least, until its final consummation in Christianity.

12. These assimilations also developed a unique and permanent type of people—the Jew. They are unique in physical appearance and endurance; unique in social life; unique in mental habitudes; unique in religious

instincts and faiths; and unique in their influence upon all other peoples.

They have maintained their type for 2,000 years under conditions most adverse, and we are warranted from the Scriptures in believing that they are reserved for yet greater influence and power when they shall be grafted back on their "own good olive tree" from which they have been cut off.

No. 43.

THE DECALOGUE.

We call the Decalogue the moral law, a summary of our duties to God, and our duties to our fellow men. It was formally promulgated from Sinai's top and the Lord wrote it on two tablets of stone for permanent preservation.

We have no record of its previous promulgation, but it was in force under the most solemn sanctions from the beginning. The law of love—love to God and love to men—was grounded in the very nature of things. It was not and is not an arbitrary law. It was endorsed by the natural conscience, and by divine rebukes, curses and judgments.

Eating the forbidden fruit was disobedience, if not much more. Cain's murder was a crime against God and man. The exceeding sinfulness of sin was in evidence throughout the antediluvian apostasy. Seth and Enoch and Noah were "Sons of God." They worshipped aright, walked with God and preached righteousness, on the one hand, and the "Sons of Men," the wicked, filled the earth with corruption, violence and wickedness until a just and righteous sentence was passed

upon them. Moral law was then as inexorable as physical law.

After the Flood the conflict of good and evil in the hearts and lives of men continued as relentless as before, along the same old lines, righteousness and wickedness. The story is told in the most matter-of-fact way, as we shall note presently.

If the Book of Job was written about one hundred years before the Exodus we find in it an exhaustive recognition and discussion of great moral issues, before ever Moses wrote, and neither Moses, nor the prophets, nor the later Scriptures, have added anything new.

We come now to locate the Decalogue as a universal covenant, whether we look backwards or forwards; permanent and unchangeable, the expression of the divine holiness, the final test of right and wrong. It contains the great regulative principles of human thought, disposition and action, as vindicated in the Sermon on the Mount. The Decalogue was nothing new under the sun. We may illustrate this in detail.

1. The first commandment forbade polytheism. New? Why the war against it had been fought to a finish on the field of Zoan but a short time before.

2. The second word forbade idolatry. Centuries before, idolatry had crept into Jacob's family and dependents, and when he returned to Bethel and set up an altar he collected all their idols and idolatrous trinkets and hid them under an oak by Shechem. Why? Gen. 35:1–4.

3. Oaths were for confirmation, and contracts were ratified, and covenants established by oaths for centuries previous. False oaths were accounted blasphemy and made a man an outlaw.

4. The Sabbath law dated back to creation and was

no novelty at Sinai. Only a few days before, the entire people had spontaneously kept the Sabbath when both experience and the divine command seemed to be against it. "Remember" says the lawgiver, do not forget it. Remember to keep it holy.

5. Honor thy father and mother. We need only contrast the conduct of Joseph and of his brethren, who well-nigh broke their father's heart.

6. "Thou shalt not kill." The covenant with Noah declared the sacredness of human life—life for life.

7. Tamar played the harlot and was sentenced to be burnt with fire. Reuben's sin was not forgiven. Why? Uncleanness was always a sin.

8. Theft and other dishonest practices were always incompatible with rights of property.

9. Truth is the basis of confidence and fellowship between man and man. Abraham and Isaac both got into trouble here. When Joseph's blood-stained coat was presented to Jacob it was the very refinement of falsehood and cruelty.

10. Covetousness inspires any and every encroachment on another's rights. Lot coveted the richer pasturage in the plain of the Jordan and "pitched his tent towards Sodom."

The question recurs here, why was such prominence given to these ten words at this time, both in the delivery from Sinai's brow, and in Jehovah's own handwriting on the two tables of stone? The answer is easy.

The theocratic covenant had just been ratified and written in a book. The civil, social, political and ecclesiastical fabric was about to be constructed with full and complete detail. A foundation was needed on which to build, as solid as the everlasting hills and as enduring

as the throne of God himself. This foundation was the moral law.

The thunderings, the smoke, the fire, the trembling mountain, and the voice of Jehovah making proclamation, inspired the profoundest awe of their God and king, and still inspires him who reads.

The two tables of the law were placed in the Ark of the Covenant under the mercy seat, where the Shekinah dwelt between the Cherubims. Perhaps the Psalmist referred to this when he sung, "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne." Or this may well have been their motto, "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

No. 44.

IDOLATRY.

The idol is an image of something in "Heaven above (the heavens above) or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth," to be used in some sort of ceremonial or ritual worship. Such worship is called idolatry, and is forbidden in the second commandment in all its forms and modifications.

Idols have been made of all possible materials, gold, silver, iron, bronze, wood, stone, clay, paints, etc., according to the wealth, taste and culture of the worshipper.

They have been used in the worship of all gods, the true as well as the false. The philosophy of their use has varied with the intelligence of the worshipper. The ignorant savage has his fetish, which he loves or hates with superstitious fancy. Another wears his idol as an amulet or charm to ward off evil. Others make the idol an actual god, or a real personality to be propitiated

by worship. Others, again, make the idol a habitat for the god, who passes in or out at the pleasure of the worshipper.

Others still, of more intelligence, scoff at the charge that they worship their idols. They claim to use the image to stimulate the imagination and elevate their conceptions of things divine and spiritual, just as the fine arts—music, painting and statuary—cultivate and develop the aesthetic faculty. It would not be difficult to show that they confound the spiritual and the aesthetic.

We need only to note that this has been for centuries the attitude of the Papacy. During the formative period of the Papacy the iconoclastic controversies were the bitterest in Christendom, and threatened the stability of church and state. But in the end images, paintings, statuary, relics and saints became the fixed and normal worship in shrines, churches and cathedrals, even unto this day. It is true they explain it away. But every hour in the day, from dawn to dark, their votaries may be seen kneeling and counting their beads before the images of Mary and other patron saints.

The Protestant reformation rebelled against Papal idolatry and restored simple spiritual worship, and pledged to uphold the second commandment as well as the first. It is, however, sad to see that Protestants to-day overlook and even condone Papal idolatries; and as wealth and culture increases worship is becoming more and more aesthetic. Aestheticism is the half-way house back to popery.

We know but little of the origin of worship with images, or idolatry. Polytheism seems to have antedated it. I find no evidence of either before the Flood. After the Flood they grew up in the silent period between

Noah and Abraham. In the more extended history from Abraham on down they are both referred to as no novelty. But they both seem to be more and more entrenched as the centuries passed and as apostasy grew.

Sabianism seems to have been the earliest polytheistic cult. It was worship of the heavenly bodies—the sun, the moon, the principal planets, and the constellations. These bear the names of their gods down to more recent times—Baal, Astarte, and Ashteroth—Mars, Tellus, Venus, Jupiter and Neptune—each and all with distinct jurisdictions.

Astrology was a prominent phase of this cult and professed to trace in the constellations, in the signs of the Zodiac, and in the movements of the planets, all the conspiring and opposing supernatural forces among their gods, and resultant human destinies.

The Sabians worshipped with their faces turned towards the heavenly bodies, as the dwelling places of their gods. It was easy for this to degenerate into the worship of the bodies themselves. Now these bodies were out of their sight one-half of every day, and were often hidden for days and weeks in clouds and fogs and storms, when the help of their gods was most needed.

It was therefore an accommodation to their gods and to themselves to make images and symbols with which their gods might be worshipped at any and all times.

In the course of time all the forces of nature were deified as in the Egyptian and Hindoo pantheons, and idols, realistic or symbolic, were multiplied accordingly.

In the history of God's people there are found two kinds of idolatry. The first and perhaps the earliest was the worship of God with idols, sometimes called ritual idolatry. It was always denounced and treated as a great sin, but it was not apostasy. The other kind

of idolatry was the worship of false gods like Baal. Astarte, Moloch and Beelzebub, and it was absolute apostasy from the true God.

It had this superadded criminality. It sought to dethrone the Lord Jehovah, the civic head of the theocratic commonwealth. This in itself was high treason. It also sought to subvert the ecclesiastical commonwealth, and to place a devil at its head in place of the Son of God. It is easy to see that this kind of idolatry was far the worse of the two.

This was the idolatry of polytheism and paganism all around the Hebrews for many centuries from Moses to the captivity and it made serious inroads upon them, and was finally responsible for the overthrow of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

We may close this discussion by making mention of several cases of ritual idolatry in worship of the true God.

1. The images stolen by Rachel from her father Laban were presumably of this kind, for no false God is mentioned, and Abraham's kinsmen in Syria were evidently of the same faith as himself.

2. The bullock made by Aaron at Mount Sinai was a symbol of the power of him who delivered them from Egypt and it is so declared, and they sung and danced and feasted as before the Lord.

3. The image made by Micah and his provision for permanent worship is another case. And when a part of the tribe of Dan took Laish and called it Dan, they took Micah's image and his priest and set up permanent worship there until the captivity.

4. When Jeroboam and the ten tribes separated from Judah he modified the Mosaic ritual in several particulars. Notably he set up calves (bullocks) at Bethel and

Dan where the people might worship God and not go down to Jerusalem. This sin of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, became the policy of the kingdom of Israel. The apostasy began in the days of Ahab and Jezebel with varying success. Though Elijah and Elisha and several hundred prophets stemmed the tide for a hundred years, it finally prevailed.

No. 45.

EPOCHS IN THE HISTORY.

It is natural to divide history into epochs which are bounded, or ushered in, by some great event, and usually controlled and directed by some great personality. We may discover the epochs in Bible history for four thousand years.

1. Creation was the starting point of the race. The Creator gave and defined all their rights, franchises, constitutions, laws, and customs, both social, civil and religious. This epoch embraced the Antediluvian period.

2. The Flood closed this epoch with untold disaster, and Noah introduced the second period with enlarged covenants. We know but little of this silent epoch except the genealogies. Toward the close of the period we are introduced to varied civilizations and to apostatizing peoples.

3. The covenant with Abraham introduces to us a unique personality whose influence and impress will never be lost. His name is a name to charm with to the end of time. This epoch extended four hundred and thirty years to Moses.

4. He led his people out to Mount Sinai. All the scenes at Sinai—the Sinaitic Covenant, the forty years in the wilderness and the conquests east of the Jordan—

all cluster about his name and may be considered as a unit in this brief epoch which included also the division of the land under Joshua.

5. Paul starts the next epoch from the division of the land and assigns four hundred and fifty years to the Judges down to Samuel, the prophet.

6. Samuel, the prophet, himself also a judge, closed the period of the judges and proclaimed the kingdom by divine direction and the outlook was matter for pride and joy. Saul's mistakes and sins culminated in disaster, ignominy and shame. But David and Solomon raised the kingdom to the very zenith of power and glory, with the arts of war and peace, for the next eighty years.

7. The story of the decline is sad indeed, and the next epoch begins with the division of the kingdom. The kingdoms of Judah and Israel went down in the darkness of the several captivities, never to be restored.

8. The seventy years of captivity are treated as a mere point of time, and Daniel and Cyrus introduce a new era by rebuilding Jerusalem and the temple. The nucleus that returned, and were fostered by Ezra and Nehemiah was so insignificant in comparison with the whole of the Jewish people, that the period is called the Diaspora, or the period of the Dispersion till Christ.

9. One epoch more. Its nether limit is the overthrow of the Jewish polity and the destruction of the city and the temple by the "abomination of desolation"—the Roman armies.

10. This introduced the tenth era, of slavery, oppressions, persecutions, murders, and long centuries of darkness throughout the earth, and the end is not yet.

11. They have the promise of yet one more era—an era of restoration—an era of blessing, for God has not

cast off his people forever. The natural branches that were cut off shall be grafted back on their own good olive tree. They have a sure word of promise. But the time, the mode, the measure, and the details of the fulfillment are all beyond our ken to tell.

No. 46.

MONUMENTAL CUSTOMS. THEIR EVIDENTIAL VALUE.

It has been customary in all ages to erect durable monuments to commemorate great events, or to keep in memory persons whose names might rot. Every tombstone and every mauseleum in the cemeteries of the ages were set up and inscribed for this purpose. The pyramids of Egypt, the bas-reliefs of sieges and victories found in Babylonia, the marble tombs and turrets of the Maccabees, seen from far out at sea, and countless others along the ages down to the majestic Washington monument in our nation's capital, illustrate this world-wide usage.

These all bear their silent testimony to names and facts inscribed upon them. They are countless in number, shape, size, taste, and fancy. They have all aimed at durability. Horace says "*monumentum exegi perennius aere.*" But the tooth of time and the erosion of climate and the decay and debris of cities and encroachment of deserts and iconoclastic hands have made havoc of their inscriptions and testimonies.

The discovery and interpretation of these things have given birth to a new science that we call archaiology. If they could all be discovered and restored and read we would be able to write the history of pre-historic times as accurately as the great bulk of more recent written history. It is not our purpose now to discuss the

evidential value of such records, except to say that we are yet hardly on the threshold of the wonderful revelations and confirmations of divine truth as found in Holy Writ.

This, however, ought to be said. Inscriptions are not always truthful. The reader of epitaphs is silently reminded of the adage, *nil de mortuis nisi bonum.* Many an ancient tablet or monument, inscribed by kings and warriors is replete with falsehood or suppression of the truth. Whole pyramids and obelisks have been stolen; their inscriptions have been chiseled off and new inscriptions engraved with as little compunction as the stock thief alters the owner's mark or brand.

The caption of this article suggests another style of monuments which are not subject to decay, and which may not be falsified in the interest of personal ambition —monumental customs. They are built by the consensus of whole peoples, and sometimes of many peoples.

They originate in real facts and experiences and are of permanent significance, subject, however, to modifications in the details of continuous usage and exposition. Tradition often modifies without destroying or even impairing the validity of their testimony to the facts and principles in which they originated.

A secular illustration may suffice. The observance of the fourth of July is a monumental custom of the United States. It is often observed by courtesy among the peoples in other climes. It points back to the indisputable birthday of a great nation. This custom is observed by the learned statesman, by the new-made alien citizen and by the ignorant negro who strikes the match to explode the fireworks. This custom needs no credentials to give it right of way, but itself is the

unchallenged witness to the facts and principles for which it stands.

We are now in position to discover the origin and explanation of numerous monumental customs which are mentioned in the Scriptures. Holy Writ defines their significance and they in turn furnish unimpeachable testimony to the Scriptures.

1. The observance of the seventh day Sabbath, from its original sanctification at creation, down to the time of Christ. The only solution of this custom is the Bible account, which has the right of way.

2. The observance of the Lord's day, the first day of the week, is a monumental custom which testifies to the resurrection of Christ, and can be accounted for in no other way. No other theory could have displaced the seventh day.

3. Jewish circumcision sealed the Abrahamic covenant and the rite is still administered at eight days old and to proselytes. To what does this custom testify? We need not enlarge.

4. Arabic circumcision. The males are still circumcised at thirteen years old; that was their father, Ishmael's, age when the rite was administered to him. Who can maintain that the Bible story was invented to fit the Arabic rite which was adopted for some unknown reason?

5. Or, take the Jewish Passover with its fulness of detail in the observance. We read in every repetition the story of Israel's last night in Egypt, their hasty meal, the sprinkling of the blood, the safety of their first-born, and the death in every Egyptian household.

6. The feast of Tabernacles was a commemorative annual custom. Of what? Of the forty years in the

wilderness, with a superadded thanksgiving for annual mercies.

7. The feast of Purim. If there had been no Ahasuerus, no Haman, no Mordecai, and no Queen Esther, there would have been no feast of Purim. They are all bound together with hooks of steel, and the Book of Esther is vindicated against all the critics.

8. The feast of Dedication has no Scriptural origin, but it gives its testimony to the substantial accuracy of the history of the struggle of the Maccabees with Antiochus Epiphanes. Profane history tells of no struggle more heroic and extraordinary.

9. If the Gospel story needed any confirmation from monumental customs, we would cite the two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Their joint testimony to the plan and processes of redemption leaves nothing to be added. Whenever and wherever administered and received in faith, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented, sealed and applied to believers.

These monumental customs and others that might be cited furnish cumulative unimpeachable testimony to the truth of Scripture. Or, to change the figure, they are so interlaced and intertwined in the imperishable web of divine truth that not a single thread can be extracted.

A hostile critic may explain away one or more of these customs to his own satisfaction, but he can't explain them all away.

There have been human inventions, will worship, pious frauds and absurd customs, such as doing penance, counting beads, genuflexions, prayers for the dead, holy water, extreme unction and such like, palmed off on a credulous and superstitious people. Even these things give testimony to their origin and purpose. "God made man upright, but he sought out many inventions."

No. 47.

THE THREE GREAT FEASTS.

These were the Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. They were all memorial feasts with certain superadded features of divine appointment. If any details of human invention and will worship were at any time added and practiced without authority they were not binding on the observer.

They all three seem to have two phases, one civil and one ecclesiastical. This was true of other things also in the Jewish ritual. The obvious reason for this is found in the fact that every person was a member of two commonwealths which were nearly coterminous.

1. The Passover. God commanded the observance of it throughout their generations in memory of its first observance in Egypt. All the details were observed as memorials. It delivered a people and was observed by a people. This indicates its civil side or aspect. The uncircumcised, whether Jew or Gentile, were barred from its observance.

The ceremonially unclean were not allowed to partake. This indicates an ecclesiastical or religious test. To the eye of faith its details were both symbolic and typical, all of which was fulfilled when "Christ our passover, was sacrificed for us."

It was observed just at the beginning of the harvest. They were not allowed to put in the sickle until the offering of a sheaf of the first fruits. This ceremony was a superadded feature. It was set for the first day of the week, the day after the Sabbath that fell in Passover week, and not on the sixteenth of Nisan, as most authorities maintain. There is no Scripture warrant for this if we admit that "The Sabbath" always meant the

seventh day Sabbath, and not a mere festal Sabbath.

2. Pentecost. This came on the first day of the week —seven weeks, fifty days; or forty-nine according to our count—after the offering of first fruits. It is sometimes called the feast of weeks.

The author's views here are confirmed in Christ's last week. Friday was the fifteenth of Nisan, Saturday (the Sabbath) was the sixteenth, and Sunday was the seventeenth—the day for the first fruits—the first day of the week, and Christ rose from the dead that day and became the "first fruits of them that slept," thus fulfilling the type. And Pentecost fully came on the first day of the week, just seven weeks later.

At Pentecost the harvest was over, and a second and "new offering of first fruits" was presented in a different form; not a sheaf this time, but grain, ground, seasoned, leavened and baked into bread, the symbol of the completed harvest. All this was coupled with great joy and rejoicing before the Lord, a national thanksgiving. We find this in Deut. 16:9–12.

What was the memorial element in this feast? Moses adds in verse 12 "Thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt." It evidently was a double thanksgiving—for deliverance from bondage and for abundant harvests. It is claimed that it was a memorial of the giving of the law from Sinai's top on Pentecost. This was impossible, for they did not reach Sinai till sixty days after the Passover, possibly ninety days, according to the mode of counting.

3. The feast of Tabernacles. The memorial nature of this feast is prominent. It called to mind their dwelling in tents for forty years in the wilderness. This was an experience never to be forgotten. We need not dwell upon it.

It is also called the feast of Ingathering. The fruits of the land were all gathered in at that date, the fifteenth day of the seventh month. It was a great national holiday and thanksgiving for the past year, and a plea for the future, and was kept for eight days, socially, civilly, religiously, and with great rejoicing.

The great value of these three Great Feasts is easy to see. The males from twelve years old attended them three times a year. Many women also made the pilgrimage when convenient to do so. Patriotism, brotherhood, consecration, and religious enthusiasm were thereby cultivated and intensified.

Their loyalty to the Lord, their king and their God, found expression in free will offerings unto the Lord at each and every one of these three Great Feasts. Moses says, "They shall not appear before the Lord empty. Every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which he hath given thee." These free will offerings, three times a year, were not tithes.

No. 48.

THE SABBATICAL YEAR. THE TWO JUBILEES.

There are many misconceptions concerning the seventh year Sabbath. We shall aim to gather all the Bible reveals concerning it, both actual statements and necessary implications.

1. Every seventh year was appointed as a year of rest for the land, in which there should be no tillage, no vinedressing, no ingathering of crops or fruits.

2. Every seventh Sabbatical year is called a "Jubilee," "this jubilee," and "the jubilee." A jubilee was

a period ushered in with a noisy and joyous blowing of trumpets.

The use of the indefinite article, "a," and the definite article "the," and the definite pronoun "this," assures us of other jubilees. Now when we note that the six Sabbatical years and the seventh all agree exactly in details of observance, with one exception, we may fairly conclude that they were all jubilees, and were all ushered in with the blowing of trumpets and were all equally jubilees, except that the seventh was entitled to pre-eminence.

3. This blowing of trumpets was on the tenth day of the seventh month. This day was also the "Great Day of Atonement." This day with its most solemn rites and ceremonies, was a fitting day to usher in a holy year. Levit. 25:9.

4. This seventh year was a Sabbath, definitely so called. It is called the "land's Sabbath," and the Lord called it "my Sabbath." The seventh day Sabbath was a holy day. So with the first and last days of the Passover and tabernacles, and other memorial and festal days of divine appointment, all of which he calls "my Sabbaths." He challenged them all for religious purposes. A Sabbath was rest for religious purposes.

5. Mere cessation from labor was in no sense religious and had no element of holiness. Mere physical rest did not constitute Sabbath keeping. The resting of cattle, spindle, loom and land make no holy time, but is necessary to Sabbath keeping by their owners.

There may be and doubtless are physical and economic reasons for this rest apart from Sabbath observance, but the Scriptures make no mention of them. Holy resting, rest for worship, is paramount; physical rest is incidental and ancillary. The Sabbath was made for man and its

true observance is always personal. The Sabbath year was an holy year.

6. It is called a "Sabbath unto the Lord," and a "Sabbath for the Lord." Levit. 25:2, 4. His jealousy for the observance of this Sabbath was almost past definition, except as we read it in the twenty-sixth chapter of Leviticus. Moses foretells all the horrors connected with the captivity which should be visited upon the people because they would fail to keep this Sabbath. Levit. 26:33–43. All of this took place in due season because they neglected this Sabbath for several centuries. The disasters continued "Until the land had enjoyed her Sabbaths; for as long as she lay desolate she kept Sabbath, to fulfill three-score years and ten." 2 Chron. 36:21.

We may further say that the covenant to keep all his Sabbaths was the basis of all blessings on one hand and disasters on the other. They were a sign between them and their God and when they were not kept the covenant was broken.

7. We are now shut in to believe that secular pursuits were suspended this seventh year Sabbath, and they spent the year in religious culture and spiritual training, with the aid and under the direction of parents, priests, Levites and prophets.

8. There were certain civil provisions connected with these Sabbath years which we need only name in this connection.

(a) The namumission of all Hebrew slaves, with specified exceptions.

(b) The cancellation of all debts at the close of the year—a general bankrupt law. The poor were thus allowed an even start to retrieve their fortunes. Foreigners were exempted from its provisions.

(c) The spontaneous fruits of the ground were left for slaves, foreigners, the poor, and the poor Levite.

(d) One other provision was added on the seventh Sabbath year—the return of lands that had been alienated, to the families to which they had belonged.

We are now prepared to see that this Sabbath was no mere incident in the Mosaic system, but was fundamental and of supreme importance, both civilly and religiously.

No. 49.

PROVISION FOR THE POOR.

Christ says, "The poor you have always with you." Moses says, "The poor shall never cease out of the land." The poor have been given to the more prosperous as a heritage, and the general principle to be observed is, "Therefore I command thee, saying, Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor and thy needy, in thy land." Deut. 15:11. Christ intimates that this shall be the leading test in the general judgment, as set forth in Matt. 25:31–46.

The general injunction to help the poor was not sufficient, but unique provision was made for their relief in a systematic way. Some of these provisions conferred rights of relief upon the poor. Some implied self help, some protected them from oppression and exactions, and others still enjoined systematic generosity. Several of these provisions were safeguarded by law and custom for the protection of all parties. We may enumerate briefly.

1. The gleanings of crops, vineyards and orchards were to be left for the poor, the widow and the orphan. The story of Ruth tells how self help and generosity met in this custom.

2. There was allowed no tillage or vinedressing on the Sabbatical year, but all the volunteer crops and fruits were left for the slave, the poor Levite, and the poor, whether homeborn or stranger. This became the battle-ground between covetousness and greed on the one hand, and generosity and spirituality on the other. The issue is stated in No. 48.

3. The Poor Tithe. This tithe was set aside and laid up at home to be distributed to the poor as it might seem to be needed. This was systematic relief by an intelligent and conscientious giver. We need not argue the reflex influence of systematic giving.

4. They were not allowed interest on loans to their poor brethren. Debt and interest widen the breach between the rich and the poor. "The rich ruleth over the poor, and the borrower is servant to the lender.' Prov. 22:7.

5. The cancellation of debts every seventh year was a still further safeguard against hopeless poverty. This gave the poor and the unfortunate a chance to take a new start toward retrieving their fortunes, without hopeless discouragement.

6. So far legislation would seem to be all in favor of the poor debtor, and oblivious of the rights of the creditor. It is well understood that indiscriminate charity pauperizes the poor and cuts the nerve of industry and honest effort. The pauper learns to demand help and to depend upon it as his right. Something more was needed to preserve a wholesome equilibrium. What is it?

7. The creditor had unlimited power to collect debts, even to the temporary enslavement of the debtor and his family. This enslavement was usually terminated by the Sabbatical year. Such borrowers could give no gilt-edged security and paid no interest. The loan in

such cases was a matter of generosity and the collection was often tempered with the same. With such checks and balances the debtor was not debauched, and the creditor remained his friend and brother.

Who now will rise up and say that these laws and customs were harsh, cruel, semibarbaric and deficient in both brotherhood and love? Do modern Christian usuages furnish anything better in dealing with the poor?

No. 50.

MOSES AND THE VEIL.

We do not know how often Moses went up on Mount Sinai for brief periods arranging the theocratic covenant between the Lord and his people and preparing them to hear the ten commandments proclaimed from Siani's top.

After this Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and the seventy elders went up and saw the God of Israel in glorious theophanic manifestations and the Nobles of Israel saw him also; and they did all eat and drink. It was a great festal day.

After six days Moses went up into the mountain, leaving Aaron and Hur in charge. He was in the mountain forty days, receiving the patterns for all things, he and Joshua together. It is not our purpose to discuss the breaking of the two tables of stone, the worship of the golden calf, the punishments and Moses' intercessions.

He went back into the mount alone carrying two tables of stone for God to write the ten words again, and he was gone forty days again; and he did neither eat nor drink. The Lord came down out of the cloud and made that thrilling proclamation of his name found in Ex. 24: 6–8.

In answer to Moses' plea for his people he renewed the

covenant on several specified conditions, all of which Moses was commanded to write.

When he came down he did not know that his face shone with radiant splendor. The sight was so glorious that Aaron and the people dared not come nigh him. This wonder suggests two things to our faith. The first is the transforming power of close contact with God. The second is that our faces, and indeed our entire bodies, shall be ineffably glorious in their final redemption.

He had to put a veil upon his face before the people would draw nigh to hear his experiences and revelations in the mountain. He removed the veil when he went in (to the old tabernacle) to talk to the Lord "face to face." This doubtless lasted till he had expounded in full what he had received of the Lord on the mountain.

Other passages of Scripture teach the transforming power of divine contact. We may note a few.

1. 1 John 3:2. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." The likeness here referred to is holiness—the beauty of holiness—for the next verse says, "And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself as God is pure."

2. 2 Cor. 3:18. "We all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory even as by the Spirit of the Lord." This transformation is here represented as progressive till it reaches its climax.

3. Such passages as these, "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord;" "The pure in heart shall see God;" "The peacemakers shall be called sons of God," all imply an actual likeness as the basis of mutual relations, all wrought by the word and by the spirit.

4. The resurrection body shall be exactly adjusted to dwell forever with the Lord. The transfiguration scene, and also John's vision of the glorified Christ on Patmos, and Paul's portrayal of the resurrection body, in 1 Cor. 15, do attest this transformation of the body into the likeness of Christ's glorified body. So also Phil. 3:21, and 1 Cor. 15:51–52.

5. All these transformations of the body and the spirit are attributed to the power of Christ in his double resurrection call and also to the purifying and sanctifying instrumentality of the Holy Spirit, and the quickening of the Father. John 5:21–29.

6. Paul, in 2 Cor. 3:6-18, cites and discusses this veil of Moses as a type of the attitude of the Jews of his day and till now. The exposition of the type is very difficult, and seems almost alien, if not contradictory to the obvious lesson of the incident as given in Exodus.

Many comments seem even more difficult to understand than the use he makes of the type. We may be excused for venturing another. Paul cites two ministrations, the Law and the Gospel.

THE LAW.	THE GOSPEL.
1. A ministration of death—glorious.	1. A ministration of life—more glorious.
2. A ministration of condemnation—glorious.	2. A ministration of justification—more glorious.
3. A ministration to be done away—glorious.	3. A ministration to remain—more glorious.
4. Moses wore the veil because of their ignorance and unbelief of the law.	4. They still wear the veil of ignorance and unbelief of the Gospel on their hearts.

"This veil is done away with in Christ" though it is still on their hearts when they read Moses. They did not see that the glorious ministration of the Law was fulfilled in the more glorious ministration of the Gospel. "But we all (who believe) with open face (without a veil) beholding in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory (from the lower glory to the higher) even as by the Spirit of the Lord."

No. 51.

THE TWO TABERNACLES. THEIR SEVERAL FEATURES.

It is commonly supposed that there was only one sacred tabernacle, probably because so much prominence is given to the pattern, building and uses of one and so little is said about the other. We shall designate them as the old and the new.

The old tabernacle was evidently brought out of Egypt and was used by Moses and the people before the patterns for the new had been promulgated or any move made toward building it.

We find in Ex. 33:7–11, its habitual use by Moses and the people. The tense of the Hebrew verb justifies the notion of habitual usage instead of a single act.

We note several things. He always pitched it outside the camp. The pillar of cloud stood over it. It was called the Tabernacle of the Congregation. All who sought the Lord went out to it. When Moses went in the pillar of cloud descended and stood at the door, and all the people then worshipped, every man in his tent door. The Lord spake to Moses face to face as a man speaketh to his friend.

This tabernacle must have been their shrine, in Egypt,

where they worshipped before the Lord. We have a hint of such a shrine "Before the Lord" in Cain and Abel's time. All religions have had their imitation shrines and oracles.

The name Tabernacle of the Congregation is rendered "Tent of meeting" by the revisers. Meeting of what? We answer of the congregation. We show elsewhere that the congregation was the rulers assembled in counsel. There were seventy elders in Egypt who were rulers of limited authority and Elders also. Larger powers were given them in Sinaitic legislation. This tabernacle must have been their place of meeting, just as in the new tabernacle afterwards.

We know nothing of the construction of the Old Tabernacle that came out of Egypt, or the materials out of which it was made. We may infer that it was divided into two compartments for sacred and secular uses, as was the case with the new tabernacle.

This is certain if it be true, as certain critics consider proven, that the New Tabernacle that Moses built closely imitated, in size, proportions and general structure, the shrines and temples of Egypt. If their contention is true, it is not strange, for the shepherd kings ruled Egypt for 500 years before Moses and they worshipped Jehovah. We may fairly claim that shrines and altars, sacrifices and offerings, social and civil laws, as well as the great moral law, all date back to an older hierarchy, itself of divine origin.

The new or Mosaic Tabernacle agreed with the old or Egyptian tabernacle in all essential particulars as above set forth and we need not repeat. In its construction it was doubtless much more magnificent and costly, to be worthy of the divine architect and the enlarged commonwealth. It was the royal pavilion of their

theocratic head, and, later on, the temple was the "palace of the great King."

No doubt the furniture was more elaborate—the Ark and the mercy seat, the altar of incense, the table of the shewbread, and the golden candle stick; then the ephod and breastplate and other priestly vestments to correspond.

We need not in this article shew that two commonwealths met at this tabernacle and that the Lord was the common head of both.

No. 52.

THE TWO COMMONWEALTHS.

It is commonly supposed that there was no distinction of Church and state in the Hebrew commonwealth; and that the church was the state and the state was the church. Or, in other words, that the civil and the ecclesiastical were identical and constituted a commonwealth, which in one aspect was an hierarchy and in one aspect a secular organization, and these two constituted the Theocracy.

All unions of church and state have approximated this theory. One or the other has been dominant to wield the sword, control the revenues, administer justice and judgment, and modify government. The rivalries and struggles for domination are not yet ended. All equilibrium has been the triumph of one over the other. This must needs be so if church and state claim the same jurisdiction.

We believe that the visible church originated in the covenant with Abraham. Its organization was at first simple and patriarchal. Jacob's sons became twelve units in a spiritual commonwealth, which grew rapidly

in numbers. The first born became their priests and prophets according to patriarchal usage and tribal civil government grew up in the usual way.

All that preceded Sinaitic legislation was inchoate and prepared the way for the complete organization of two commonwealths which were not entirely coterminous.

Jacob before his death adopted Ephraim and Manasseh, the two sons of Joseph and he gave to them the property and family birthright of their father.

Jacob's dying blessings were given to his twelve sons including Joseph and Levi, and these are called the twelve tribes of Israel. Gen. 49:28. These twelve units constituted the spiritual commonwealth, and he gave them adumbrations of their civil relations and destinies as tribes. At Mt. Sinai the civil government was organized with the same twelve units except that Ephraim and Manasseh were substituted for Joseph, and Levi was omitted. Thus we see that the constitution of these two commonwealths was not identical.

These two commonwealths were adjusted to each other at Mount Sinai, and their rights, franchises and jurisdictions were carefully defined. Patriarchism was modified so as to separate the ecclesiastical and the secular. Priesthood and oracle were taken away from the first-born of the civil tribes and lodged in the tribe of Levi.

Levi had no civil tribal relations. They dwelt in forty-eight cities scattered among the twelve civil tribes to whom they owed personal allegiance. They were exempt from military service and owned and cultivated no lands but their gardens. While they were in a proper sense the servants of all, they occupied the

highest position in the ecclesiastical commonwealth and they constituted a hierarchy.

In addition to their strictly religious functions, they stood ready, without special remuneration, and as public spirited citizens, to fill any position and perform any duty laid upon them, and for which they were qualified by learning, culture and experience. They were teachers, lawyers and judges, and served wherever else civil and political issues were not involved.

Our contention is that these two commonwealths were in equilibrium, and the Lord was the head of both, but we shall not here discuss the details of their adjustment to each other, except to mention two things.

1. They both had revenues. The state derived its revenues from taxes, tribute, spoils of war and such like. These revenues were enforced and collected by authority. The church expenses and provision for her worship and for her charities were met by self assessed voluntary gifts. The state had no hand in collecting the "tithes and offerings," nor in disbursing them. The Lord has never given the civil ruler the purse strings of his people.

2. No civil ruler, nor citizen dared touch and profane the special rights and franchises of the church, lest the divine displeasure and judgment overtake him. We need only cite the cases of Nadab and Abihu and their adherents, the case of Saul, and the case of Uzziah, king of Judah.

It is not out of place here to ask, has the state no special duties to perform in this adjustment? We answer, yes. As in the case of the family and of the Sabbath, so here, it is her duty to conserve and protect the rights of all parties.

In Rev. 7:4-8, we find the names of twelve tribes,

evidently the spiritual commonwealth, for Joseph and Levi are enumerated. But there is one unsolved difficulty: Manassah is inserted in the place of Dan. We are shut in to the hypothesis that it was a mistake of an early transcriber. Still no authority for this suggestion has yet been found in any ancient manuscript, or version, or quotation.

No. 53.

THE GOLDEN CANDLESTICK.

We are familiar with the copy of the carving on Titus' triumphal arch at Rome. It is usually accepted as representing the candlestick taken by Titus when he spoiled the temple. There is reason to believe that it was a forgery of the architect, intended to glorify Titus and to humiliate the Jews. It has few of the proper features of the Candlestick of the Tabernacle.

Besides, it is well-nigh certain that the Ark, the altar of incense, the table for the shew bread, the candlestick, and the breastplate were not carried to Babylon, but were hidden by Jeremiah and the High Priest in a cave of Judea before Nebuchadnezzar's last siege of Jerusalem. And the second temple lacked these five articles of furniture. It was lighted by lamps hung on chains of gold.

We assume that the candlestick was an almond tree of solid gold. This will appear more evident if we proceed to build it according to the pattern God gave Moses. Ex. 25:31-40. If we seem to build it quite large in order to preserve proper symmetry and proportions, we need only remember that a talent of pure gold was used in the construction—$15,000 to $20,000.

The "shaft" was the stock or body of the tree which was rooted in a base to hold it steady, and out of this

stock there sprung seven main branches and twenty-two smaller branches as we shall see.

The central branch rose upward out of the stock in a natural way. Six other branches sprung out of the sides of the stock in spirals of three each. These spirals started opposite each other. A Plane passing through the central branch would divide the head into two symmetrical parts, three branches on each side. Verses 31, 32.

Higher up, the central branch parted into four branches and each of the six branches parted into three branches —all doubtless, in a natural and symmetrical way. On the extremities of these twenty-two small branches were affixed bowls, in shape like the shell of an almond, and of a proper size to receive the regulation lamps, and laid horizontally to receive them. Verses 33, 34.

Underneath and pendant from these small branches were knobs or burrs containing ripe almonds, and also flowers or blossoms as if for the next crop of almonds. The blossoms of the almond tree come out before the leaf buds. And it was not uncommon for burrs of the former crop to be found among them as in the case with some other fruits. This explains also the case of Aaron's rod that produced buds (bloom buds), blossoms and ripe almonds. Numb. 17:8. There were also knobs and flowers pendant from the alternate larger branches lower down.

It is probable that none of the smaller branches were of the same height and that the bowls on the ends of the branches were scattered throughout the head of the tree.

Seven lamps were made of gold of sufficient size to hold a day's supply of oil. They must have been of regulation size and shape—say, three and a half by two and a half inches, with a spout on one end for the wick

and a handle on the other end through which the forefinger could pass for easy handling. These seven lamps were set in seven of the almond-shaped bowls and were doubtless scattered throughout the head of the tree according to the taste of the officiating priest. He doubtless placed one on each of the seven branches.

When we remember that all the branches, the knobs, the flowers and the twenty-four bowls were burnished gold, we easily perceive that the reflected light of these lamps throughout the tree made a chandelier of inexpressible beauty. This was greatly enhanced by the conchoidal shape of the twenty-two bowls, each reflecting every lamp, back and forth in every possible direction.

No measurements are given, but we feel constrained to believe it was much larger and taller than is usually supposed. It must have been set on the floor of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, for no provision was made for a table or stand for it to sit upon. It must have been six or seven feet high, but not higher than the officiating priest could reach.

The head of the tree must have measured several feet in circumference. Smaller dimensions than these would not have left room for the symmetrical distribution of the twenty-two bowls. The talent of gold was sufficient material for its construction as is herein set forth.

No. 54.

SACRIFICIAL OFFERINGS. TWO CLASSES.

Sacrificial offerings unto the Lord included all that were burned wholly or in part upon the altar. There were other offerings that were called free will offerings. These were gifts for religious purposes over and above

the tithes which were enjoined. The tithes and offerings were evidently of the same general nature and were disbursed by the ministers of religion and had no sacrificial nor typical significance.

Sacrificial offerings were also called oblations. They were sometimes given on occasion, sometimes on fulfillment of vows and almost universally on festal days.

Sacrificial offerings were made through an officiating priest who was himself a type of Christ. He was a divinely appointed mediator between the offerer and his God. It would be easy to show that priests have been coeval and co-extensive with the race. From the briefest notices we know that Adam and his sons, Noah and his descendants, Job and Melchizedek, and Abraham and his descendants, offered sacrifices to God. The priests of the ages were evidently a patriarchal hierarchy.

At Mount Sinai there were no new sacrificial principles, and probably no new sacrificial customs were promulgated. Altars of stone, holy fire, clean beasts and birds, the sprinkling of blood, and officiating priests were no novelties at Mount Sinai. The hierarchy was there transferred to the tribe of Levi and to the family of Aaron. The times and seasons and the details of sacrificial administration were all adjusted to an ecclesiastical commonwealth which had grown to large proportions. We need not enumerate them. They are written out in full detail.

It is a curious fact that we find no categorical definitions of the details of the ceremonial law, in which sacrifice is the central rite about which all the rest is adjusted. Why? There was no occasion for it. It had been handed down and administered by inspired priests and prophets throughout the ages according to

the spiritual needs and religious exigencies of the worshippers.

They needed no Epistle to the Hebrews to expound the true significance of their sacrificial rites. Nor did the people of Paul's day need such exposition. If we read Paul aright, he cites the known and accepted significance of these rites in order to set up and illustrate the claims of Christ.

There were two classes of these sacrificial offerings—bloody offerings and meat offerings. The former was a victim slain for the remission of sins. The victim died, the sinner lived. It was life for life. It was a vicarious atonement. The latter was a thank offering and consisted of cereals in any stage of preparation for eating, with the usual seasonings of salt and oil, and also frankincense laid upon the offering, but not mixed with it.

We shall not here enumerate the details of the sprinkling of the blood, the burning on the altar, the eating by priests and sometimes by the offerer, and their several portions. It is only our purpose here to indicate certain features of these sacrificial offerings which are not so obvious.

1. Every offering was seasoned with salt and so was of the nature of a covenant ratified with salt, "the salt of the covenant of thy God." Lev. 2:13. In Ps. 50:5, we read, "Gather my saints together unto me, those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice."

2. We note also a festal element. This implies communion and fellowship. The Lord's festal portion was consumed with holy fire from heaven. It is sometimes said that he smelled a sweet savor ascending from the sacrificial altar. The parts eaten by the priest were sacred to him as representing the offerer. In the peace offerings the offerers ate their portions with great

rejoicing. All this pointed to the communion and fellowship under the Gospel.

3. If these two features are scriptural features of their sacrificial system then we may claim for it sacramental features. Worthy participants with a prospective faith were partakers of all the benefits of the Gospel as set forth or embodied in the sacraments instituted by Christ. It would not be difficult so to paraphrase the definitions so as to fit the experience of believers in both dispensations.

No. 55.

BLOODY OFFERINGS. FOUR CLASSES.

There were four classes of bloody offerings, burnt offerings, sin offerings, trespass offerings, and peace offerings. It goes without saying that every bloody offering was a penal substitute for sin and was a type of Christ. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." It is not our purpose here to enumerate the details of these several offerings, wherein they all agreed, and wherein they all differed. We only seek to distinguish them from each with simple definition. Some expositors reduce them to three and classify the sin offering and the trespass offering as one and the same.

In the ritual the exact place of each one of the four is assigned, and neither can be exchanged for another. Is there any good reason for the assignment of each, or is it merely arbitrary? There must have been good and substantial reasons for the multitudinous details in the ritual. Some underlying definitive principles must have regulated all, whether we are able to analyze and discover them or not. The writer may be pardoned for

undertaking this analysis and definition, which he has found unsatisfactory in the authorities.

There were two kinds of worship in the ritual, civil and personal. It would be easy to show that the three great feasts had a civic as well as a personal aspect. The holocaust—the whole burnt offering— had no personal aspect in its more prominent use. The morning and the evening sacrifice every day in the year were not personal. The numerous burnt offerings at the major and minor feasts and at the new moons were not personal offerings. We may classify them as civic or national.

Burnt offerings were also used in consecrations and in purifications. These were all of public interest and utility, and had little if any connection with personal spiritual experiences, such as repentance and remission and a broken and a contrite heart. They seem to be civic and theocratic worship rather than personal.

The sin offering was required where infractions of the divine law were discovered and confessed and the sin remitted. They were offered where sin against God was the prominent feature of the offense. Sins of ignorance, by whomsoever committed, were declared sins when discovered, and called for the sin offering.

Great prominence was given to the sin offering wherever personal holiness was emphasized, especially on the great Day of Atonement, and in the consecration of a priest.

The trespass offering was required in the case of all offenses against others in which any harm or damage had been done wittingly or unwittingly. Along with the trespass offering the sinner confessed his sin and made restitution or paid all damage, as estimated by the high priest, and one-fifth part added thereto.

Of course this was an offering for sin and secured re-

mission, but the technical name was given it because of the trespass or damage done by the sinner and the required reparation. This is the only one of the four offerings that was limited to particular offenses.

The peace offerings were festal offerings. They were offered in great numbers at all the feasts. The offerer invited his friends to join him in his festivities and the priests and Levites evidently shared with him. When Solomon dedicated the temple at the feast of Tabernacles his peace offerings were "two and twenty thousand oxen, and one hundred and twenty thousand sheep. And a great congregation from Hamath to the river of Egypt kept the feast fourteen days, with great rejoicings."

We may repeat that every bloody sacrifice was a type of Christ and signified remission through his blood. But the conditions of the offerings were widely variant in their elaborate ritual, and each had its appropriate season and lesson.

No. 56.

MEAT OFFERINGS. THREE CLASSES.

We have seen that a meat offering consisted of fruits of the ground or product of the soil, as distinguished from bloody sacrifices. They all seem to have the idea of thanksgiving instead of atonement. There were three classes.

1. The meat offering proper. This consisted of cereals seasoned with salt and oil, and might be prepared and cooked in any form in which they were usually eaten. A meat offering was required in connection with every bloody sacrifice. A memorial or a sample of it was burned on the altar along with a small amount of frankincense required. The remainder was eaten by

the priests and their families, and by the offerers on festal occasions.

2. The first fruits are also called meat offerings, but no part of them was burned on the altar. A sheaf was presented before the Lord in Passover week, at the beginning of harvest. It was the earnest and the pledge of the harvest, and typified the resurrection of Christ, "the first fruits of them that slept." A second first fruits was offered at Pentecost—leavened bread in finished form—a type of the final consummation.

3. Libations of oil and wine. The wine was called a "drink offering." No special name was given to the offering of oil. They are both generically meat offerings—fruits of the ground—the wine from the vine and the oil from the olive tree. They seem to have been an integral part of the "meat offering" in its entirety.

Jacob, on his return to Bethel, built a pillar of stone at the place where God talked with him a second time, and "He poured a drink offering thereon," and he called the place Bethel—the house of God—a second time. Here God renewed to him the covenant of Abraham and Isaac. This pillar of stone was evidently an altar, and these libations of wine and oil were an integral part of his worship thereon. Genesis 35:9-15.

These libations in definite and equal proportions were poured out in connection with all sacrificial offerings—a "memorial"—at least—and the remainder belonged to the priests in the case of the burnt offering, the sin offering and the trespass offering. But in the case of the Peace offerings the offerers used them in their festivities "before the Lord." The priests however were not permitted to drink this wine while they were engaged in official duties. A concordance will furnish ample proofs of these contentions.

No. 57.

RULES FOR SACRIFICIAL OFFERINGS. THEIR SIGNIFICANCE.

There are numerous rules laid down and enjoined covering all necessary details of sacrificial offerings. Some of them are typical, some are symbolic, and some have no spiritual significance at all. We consider the bloody sacrifices first.

1. The sacrificial victims were to be taken from flocks or herds or from three kinds of birds. The reason for limiting to these is not given and there is no spiritual significance in it. The distinction of clean and unclean is arbitrary so far as we can see. After the distinction is made it becomes symbolic of holiness.

2. The victim must be without blemish—perfect of its kind. This is typical of the perfect manhood of Christ.

3. The victim was brought to the altar—the place of sacrifice. This seems the logical place and of divine appointment.

4. The offerer laid his hands on the head of the victim confessing sin. This is imputation—typical of the guilt of sin to be laid on Christ, the sacrifice for sin.

5. The victim was slain. The victim dies, the sinner lives. Christ dies, the sinner lives.

6. The victim was then flayed, quartered and washed. There was no spiritual significance in this.

7. The blood was sprinkled, part or all, on the altar, signifying the divine acceptance of life for life. The blood is the life.

8. The blood was sometimes sprinkled on the offerer. This signified cleansing by the blood of Christ.

9. Certain parts, always, and certain other parts

sometimes, were consumed on the altar. Certain parts were given to the priests for food. Sometimes the offerer partook largely of the edible parts of the victim along with the priests and the consuming fire on the altar. The altar and its holy fire symbolized the Lord Jehovah. The priest represented the people as a mediator. The whole typified the communion and fellowship of Christ and the believer, as is also set forth in symbol in the Lord's supper. "I will come in to him and sup with him and he with me."

10. The skin was a perquisite of the priest, and the offal, head, and intestines were carried outside of the camp. There was no symbolism in this.

11. The sin offering, whose blood was carried by the priest into the Holy Place, was carried entire and burned outside the gate. According to Paul this was a type of Christ who "suffered without the gate." Heb. 13:11-13.

12. Rules are given for dressing and preparing birds for sacrifice, but they seem to have no spiritual significance, any more than the dressing of animals.

13. Rules for the preparation of meat offerings seem to have no special significance, except that they were seasoned with salt. This is called "the salt of the covenant of thy God." It indicates the covenant character of the offerings. Covenants were ratified by sacrifice, Ps. 50:5, and salt ratifies a covenant to this day.

We may remark in general; we must guard against fanciful typologies and symbolisms. But how? They must be limited to essential features. The trend of Scripture and frequent references to these things with a modicum of common sense enables us to get the truth of these matters.

An extreme allegorizing exegesis finds a type in every person, every act, every event, every number and every

thing in the Old Testament. This necessitates an equally licentious allegorizing exegesis of the New Testament.

No. 58.

HOLY FIRE.

If we are right in supposing that the altar with constant fire upon it was the symbol of Deity accepting and consuming the offerings of loyal worshippers, then Holy Fire would seem to be a necessity. Pagans have had their family altars on which holy fire was kept alive from year to year. The Magians, who copied and imitated many Jewish usages, also kept holy fire burning on their altars. If perchance it should fail it could be rekindled only by a sun glass or by a spark struck from flint. No "strange fire" could be used.

Abraham evidently had Holy fire on his altar, for he carried fire and wood three days journey to Mount Moriah when it would have been so easy to get both near by the altar he built on the mountain. We are not told how his fire was first kindled. It may have been handed down by his fathers.

But why carry wood so far? The Magians prepared the wood for their altars with great care and stored it away for use when needed and they considered it holy. It seems as if this was Abraham's custom long ages before.

Holy fire was kindled directly from heaven and was sometimes given in attestation of divine acceptance. We have several cases of such fire kindling, and there may have been many more on occasion.

When the tabernacle was consecrated fire came down and attested God's acceptance. When Manoah and his wife prepared a sacrifice for their heavenly visitor the

Angel of the Lord went up in the flame which he had kindled on the altar.

When Solomon had laid in order his unrivaled holocaust at the dedication of the temple, fire came down and consumed it all.

At Mount Carmel, the Lord answered by fire which consumed the sacrifice and the altar of stone and licked up the water in the trench round about.

The necessary use of this sacred fire was safeguarded with awful sanctions. When Nadab and Abihu used strange fire in their censers, fire came out from the Lord, and devoured them. We infer from the context that their reckless disobedience came from drinking too much wine.

It is commonly supposed that Abel's offering was approved and accepted by the answer by fire. Analogy would suggest the same in the case of Noah's great sacrifice when he came out of the ark.

No. 59.

TYPES AND SYMBOLS IN WORSHIP.

In describing and classifying acts of worship we use four terms, ceremonial, spiritual, typical and symbolic. These terms are used so loosely, without clear cut definitions and distinctions, as to cause grave misapprehensions, and justify serious errors.

All true worship is in its last analysis, spiritual. "God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." "True worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." John 4:24, 23. Formalism is its deadly enemy and has been so in all ages. Is. 1:10-15; Mat. 6:1-18.

A ceremonial is an outward form and observance, of

no value in and for itself, but expressing a true spiritual significance. Each observance is an object lesson for the intelligent faith of the worshipper. Its substance is spiritual. The form and the substance, and their mutual adjustment are of the same divine origin. There is no place for human invention or will worship in either, in the form or in the substance.

In Christian worship there are two well defined ceremonials, baptism and the Lord's supper. These were appointed, expounded and enjoined by Christ. Both of them are purely symbolic. We need not here argue their full spiritual significance.

We may not classify almsgiving, prayer and fasting as ceremonials, although they are acts of worship, because their mode, measure, seasons and forms are not enjoined in full detail, but are left to be determined by fundamental principles regulative of holy living. Far less may we admit the other five sacraments of the Romish Church.

In Old Testament times and from the beginning there was a ceremonial system of worship of greater or less fulness of detail. It was a system of ordinances which were object lessons setting forth the way of life and promoting the salvation of the worshipper.

Some of these ceremonials were types, some were symbols and some were both types and symbols in some of their details.

Types were those ordinances that had a prophetic element in them. They belong to the class of predictive prophecy—as really Messianic prophecy as the twenty-second psalm, or as the fifty-third and fifty-fifth chapters of Isaiah.

These types had a present use and value when observed, they pointed to future facts, and their present

value was derived from their future significance. The Passover lamb, the sprinkling of blood, the scape goat, and the Holy of Holies all pointed to Christ and his salvation. We need not enlarge. The ceremonials were not all types as is sometimes held, some of them were only symbolic. The unleavened bread of the Passover symbolized "sincerity and truth" according to Paul. The "bitter herbs" and numerous fastings symbolized and expressed repentance. The holy anointing oil set forth consecration.

Some were both typical and symbolic. The burning incense symbolized the prayers of the saints "and the intercession of the High Priest, and through him was a type of the intercession of Christ. We need not enlarge.

Some who find a large typical element in the ceremonial system of the Old Testament make the mistake of making it all typical. This leads to a strained and unnatural exegesis, and to a virtual loss of the beautiful and instructive symbolisms of divine appointment.

Others again clearly perceive a large symbolic element and conclude that it is all symbolic, and they reduce all types to the level of signs, symbols and figures of speech. Their next step is to eliminate predictive written prophecy and then to minimize the Supernatural in the Scriptures. Thus they open up the right of way for their evolutionary philosophy.

The distinctions of this article open up a rich and fertile field which has not yet been explored by the commentator.

No. 60.

THE BLOOD OF SPRINKLING.

No religious rite was more familiar than the sprinkling of blood, from Abel to Christ. In Heb. 11:4 we read, "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous; God testifying of his gifts; and by it he being dead yet speaketh."

In Heb. 12:18–24, Paul explains that we are not come to Mount Sinai with its terrific scenes and sanctions, but to Mount Zion and to all its glorious citizenship, "And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than Abel," or "Abel's blood."

"The blood of sprinkling." This exact phrase is found nowhere else in the Scriptures. It is the blood of Christ symbolized by all the sprinkling of blood before his day. The context fixes its significance. It was more than a symbolism. It was type and anti-type; it was prophecy and fulfillment.

These two passages tell of two speakers, Abel and Christ, one at the beginning and one at the consummation of redemption—two voices, one good, the other better—one sufficient, the other efficient.

Commentators are not agreed, whether Abel's blood here is the blood of his sacrifice, or the martyr blood that "cried" from the ground. The original might signify either, and we pervert no other scripture to make it signify both in the parallel. We may now listen to these voices.

1. Abel offered a bloody sacrifice, an atonement for his own sins, for without the shedding of blood there was

no remission. Christ offered himself a bloody sacrifice, an atonement for the sins of his people.

2. Abel offered his sacrifice in faith and he received God's witness that he was righteous. This was the righteousness of faith—justification by faith. Every believer in Christ and his blood receives the same justification by faith and the divine witness thereto.

3. The sinner needs cleansing as well as atonement. This was set forth in Abel's case by the sprinkling of the sacrificial blood on the altar and probably on his person. This symbolic cleansing was made real by faith. So the blood of Christ cleanses us from all iniquity.

4. Abel received a sense of pardoned sin, so far at least, as comes from the assurance of faith. Being justified by faith we are entitled to peace, hope and joy. Rom. 5:1, 2.

5. Did Abel understand that the blood of bulls and goats can not take away sin? The text does not say. But the study of bloody offerings for 4,000 years establishes this utterance beyond all question, and we may declare it true always and everywhere. How about the blood of Christ? "By one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."

We may turn now to the other view of Abel's blood. His blood was a martyr's blood. He died for the truth, and sealed his testimony with his blood. So did Christ. The truth he taught drove his enemies to fury, and he testified to the truth before the sanhedrim, before Pilate and on the cross.

7. Abel's blood cried to God from the ground. It cried for vengeance as does all innocent blood. Christ uttered the doom of Jerusalem and wept over the city again and again. That doom was beyond recall when they said "His blood be on us and our children." Yet

he prayed for the soldiers who crucified him, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do."

8. Now these two bloods utter largely the same things. Wherein then is the supreme excellency of one over the other? One is the type, one is the anti-type. One is the shadow, the other is the substance. One is the sign, the other is the thing signified. One is the prophecy, the other is the fulfillment.

No. 61.

FREEWILL OFFERINGS AND VOWS.

Freewill offerings were voluntary gifts for religious and charitable uses over and above the usual tithes. They were given at the three great feasts according to ability and were self assessed. They were given also on occasion and when needed and were sometimes very large, as for building the tabernacle and the temple. They consisted of gold, silver, brass, iron, precious stones, sweet spices, products of the soil, or any thing of material value that might be needed for sacred uses.

Such gifts have been customary in all religions. They are the measure of consecration and devotion, from the widow's two mites to the princely gifts of the man of wealth.

Religious vows are promises or pledges made to God, either of personal service or offerings. They differ from mere resolutions in that resolutions are promises made to one's self, or personal pledges to others for our own behest. Vows are made to God.

They are covenant promises to do or to abstain as the case may be, on conditions expressed or implied. They are usually made in times of trouble or in some recognized crisis in life.

David paid vows made when he was in trouble. Ps. 66:13, 14. He made and paid his vows in recognition of God's goodness and as an example to all God's people. Ps. 116:12–19.

Jacob made a vow to the Lord when he saw him in vision at Bethel. He was in great trouble, and besides, it was a great crisis in his life.

Nazarite vows were accepted and approved, and so also the vow of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, and his posterity. These vows pledged them to abstain from certain things indifferent in themselves in order to accentuate their devotion to God's service. John the Baptist and Paul recognized and performed such vows.

By a careful analysis of all these vows we find these several features.

1. A promise and a covenant to recognize and perform duties which were obligatory before the vow was made. Such was Jacob's vow. Gen. 28:20–22. And such are sacramental vows to-day.

2. Vows of freewill offerings are made partly in grateful remembrance of past mercies and partly in faithful expectation of future benefits from a covenant keeping God. Such vows are in no sense selfish and mercenary.

3. Vows concerning matters indifferent such as food, raiment, habitations, are doubtless of divine appointment and approval. Their sole proper purpose is to accentuate and attest the separateness of true holiness and to influence others to holy living.

These personal vows are more easily abused than others. Monastic vows of poverty and celibacy have been the curse and bane of the church. The fruitage has been selfrighteousness, spiritual pride and all uncharitableness, with the shallowest formalism. The logic of it has been conformity or inquisitional fires.

Protestantism has so reacted against all this that vows have fallen into hurtful disrepute. The Papacy and her imitators still seek to save the day with surplice and stole, with cap and gown, with cowl and hood reinforced with all the pomp and pageantry of an aesthetic worship.

4. Religious vows belong to no particular age or dispensation but to all. They are based on principles common to them all. Trouble finds relief in the faithful vow. Every recognized crisis in life may be safely passed in the same way. Vows and prayers imply each other.

5. May we not say that the prayer of faith and a father's love make him a party to the vow, and pledges him to fulfill all of its conditions?

No. 62.

THE SOJOURN IN THE WILDERNESS.

ITS SIGNIFICANCE.

The Hebrews spent one year at Sinai, before starting directly to Palestine, in preparation as a nation and a people. Their preparation was civil, political, social, religious and ecclesiastical, and probably military. They received a code of laws that covered and adjusted all these phases of their life as a people, and they acquired skill in their administration for a year. They then started to take possession of the promised land under Moses and Aaron, and under the leadership of Jehovah, their civil head and king.

Following the pillar of cloud they moved steadily to the northeast and crossed the sea road until they reached a famous oasis in the desert named Rithmah and they named it Kadesh-barnea or simply Kadesh—the Holy Place— about midway between the Mediterranean and

the Dead Sea. The place is called Kodese, Kodesh and El Cuds to this day. It is on the "Way of Shur," on the "Way of the Wilderness"—the central road out of Egypt, through the wilderness, and through the Azizimeh Pass to Beersheba and on to Hebron into the heart of Palestine.

They were now face to face with the conquest of Canaan and the Lord bade Moses send twelve men to spy out the land. We need not repeat the story of the spies and their reports; the rebellion of the congregation; the fate of ten of the spies; and Moses' intercession; until the Lord passes sentence that they should remain in the wilderness forty years until they all died in the wilderness from twenty years old and upward.

Let us note the significance of this sentence and sojourn in the wilderness.

1. Paul says they could not enter in because of unbelief. Heb. 3:19. They had abundant promises, abundantly ratified.

2. The Psalmist says that they hardened their hearts and tempted the Lord until he sware in his wrath "They should not enter into his rest. Ps. 95:7–11.

3. They had seen "God's work" in the overthrow of Egypt for unbelief and hardness of heart, and now they perished in the wilderness for the same sins. The principles of the divine administration are the same in all ages. Numb. 14:22.

4. The struggle was continued for forty years till the whole generation perished, and their "carcasses fell in the wilderness. Ps. 95:10.

5. God gave them up to worship the hosts of heaven and Molock and Remphan, punishing sin with more sin. Acts 7:42, 43.

6. This was the climax or the culmination of ten rebel-

lions and called for condign punishment "that the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." Numb. 14: 21–23.

7. They were pardoned as a people at Moses' intercession, but the line was drawn at twenty years old, between the responsible and the irresponsible. Numb. 14:11–20, 28–30 (save Caleb and Joshua).

8. It required forty years to train and develop the generation of minors, under twenty years, and their children, into a great and powerful people, sixty years old and under, with no substantial gain in numbers during the forty years.

9. According to Moses this was to them a chastening from the Lord "as a man chasteneth his son." To them it was not judgment but mercy. The severity and hardships of the desert were tempered by a father's loving care. Deut. 8:5.

10. One lesson was to teach them humility and to prove them, whether they would keep his commandments or no. Deut. 4:2.

11. They were taught another lesson, "That man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord." Deut. 8:3. With these words Christ vanquished Satan, and so may we.

12. One more lesson as found in Moses' plea for pardon, a plea he learned in the Mount when he stood in the cleft of the rock and the divine glory passed before him. "The Lord is long suffering and of great mercy, forgiving iniquity and transgression, and by no means clearing the guilty." Numb. 14:18.

No. 63.

CONTINUOUS MIRACLES.

Israel was the beneficiary of many miracles throughout their entire history down to the close of the canon. Miracles in their last analysis were evidential and confirmatory. But they had other uses also. They were sometimes punitive as in the case of the ten plagues and like the death of Ananias and his wife.

There were, however, gracious blessings like the feeding of the five thousand and other miracles of Christ, or the supply of water in Horeb. They were often wrought on occasion to provide for the necessities of his people, and they often carried with them spiritual lessons that must not be overlooked.

While miracles do not equal in grandeur the works of creation, witnessed and glorified only by the angelic host, they seem to overshadow works of providence and grace because these last are wrought out of sight.

There is a tendency to minimize the miracle as of small value and of doubtful importance. Their stupendous character is overlooked. They would seem as necessary in their place as creation on one hand and providence on the other. To deny one is to deny them all.

The forty years of Moses' administration was a miraculous dispensation, beginning with the burning bush, culminating at Sinai and continued until the crossing of the Jordan; and the miracles were so varied as to control and direct all the forces of nature and many of them were stupendous in their character and duration.

The migration of two million and a half of people in a body without a commissariat was a thing unheard of in human history, before or since, and was a literal impossibility by ordinary methods. As long as they were in

Egypt, moving across the isthmus, the problem of food and water was easy. But the problem for forty years in the wilderness was beyond human solution. The solution was divine. There were three continuous miracles which were uninterrupted for forty years. Without these the migration would have been impossible.

1. The first was the divine leadership which was a pillar of cloud by day, which became a pillar of fire by night. Nor was it a mere symbol. When the cloud moved the people followed; when the cloud rested the people abode in their place, be it a day, a month, or a year. They enjoyed the shadow of it in the burning sands of the desert by day, and by night, the fire gave them light, and needed warmth during an inclement season, all tempered and adjusted by a loving Lord.

After crossing the Red Sea their Egyptian supply of food soon gave out and the manna was given in the Wilderness of Sin and continued daily for forty years until they crossed the Jordan and ate of the old corn of the land. Arabia Petraea supplied then, and still supplies a scanty sustenance for a small Arab population, who furnished a meager market to the Hebrews who chanced to have a little money, but their real commissariat was the God-given manna.

This manna also had its symbolism, "That he might make them to know that man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live." We are also assured by Christ that this manna was a type of himself.

3. The third continuous miracle provided for their raiment for forty years. Moses says, "Thy raiment waxed not old upon thee, neither did thy foot swell, these forty years. "How their feet would have swollen walking and marching in the stony desert if their shoes

and sandals had worn out. We may note the beautiful simplicity of this continuous miracle as compared with gigantic and cumbrous quarter-master's stores for constant distribution, had they been possible.

Analogy would justify us in believing that these unfailing garments were a type of the righteousness of Christ—the wedding garment of our Lord.

These continuous miracles make it easy to our faith to believe in the continuous loving providence of our heavenly father. We may trust him for food and raiment and every needed blessing, and "He knoweth what things we have need of before we ask him."

No. 64.

THE MURMURINGS AND REBELLIONS.

The careless reader of the history is apt to imagine that the murmurings and rebellions of the Hebrews against Moses and against God were strangely fatuous, unreasonable and irrational. It is hardly fair to judge them from our point of view, for we have the inside history of them all and the consequences, compared with which their discontent and discomfort seems childish. It is easy to look on from the outside and see their folly.

It is not our purpose to excuse them or to palliate their sin and folly in their frequent and numerous murmurings, much less to criticise the severity of the punishments sometimes inflicted. But we propose to show that they sprung of some great crisis through which they were passing.

Their condition and environment were unique. There was the migration of an enormous camp of two millions, and the sojourn in a howling wilderness. They left behind them the land of Goshen—the garden spot of

the earth. They were passing through rapid changes, social, civil and religious, which embodied fundamental principles poorly understood.

The enforced leisure of camp life was unfavorable to a contented spirit, and the demagogue found easy access to the multitude. Panic and fanatical impulse had equal access, and the half assimilated mixed multitude was the hot-bed of mischief. Personal ambition and impatience of restraint, also played their part. Politico-religious parties also raised treasonable issues. In all these respects they were exactly like other peoples, except that the Lord stood behind and out of sight to foster, restrain or punish.

The source of all their trouble was "an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God." Faith is the chart, the compass and the sheet anchor amid the storms and vicissitudes of life. Their faith often failed them.

Quite a number of these murmurings and rebellions are recorded in the history and there are plain indications that there were many more during the forty years that are not recorded. Ps. 95:8-10. We shall mention all that are recorded with brief comment.

1. After they had covenanted with Moses and the Lord to be led out of Egypt Pharaoh greatly increased their oppressions. They complained bitterly to Moses, and he to the Lord. Ex. 5:21-23. When the Lord sought to comfort them, they hearkened not, "For anguish of spirit and cruel bondage." Ex. 6:9.

2. When they were encamped at the Red Sea and were hemmed in by the sea and the mountains and Pharaoh's pursuing host they complained yet more bitterly against Moses and against God. They

preferred bondage in Egypt to death in the wilderness. Terror overcame their faith. Ex. 14:10-12.

3. When they encamped at Marah and found the water bitter, so that they could not drink it, they murmured against Moses in their thirst. Moses carried the matter to God, and the water was cured. Ex. 15: 23-25.

4. When they reached the wilderness of Sin (Sinai) the supply of food which they had brought out of Egypt was exhausted and they experienced the pangs of hunger. They complained bitterly and murmured against Moses and against God because they had been brought away from the fleshpots and abundant bread in Egypt. Ex. 16:2, 3.

5. In Rephidim, the last station before reaching Sinai, they were in great distress for want of water. Their faith failed them and they were so infuriated that they were about to stone Moses. But the rock, when smitten, yielded abundance of water. They called the place Meribah.

These first five cases were overlooked and not punished either because of distressing conditions or because of abounding mercy, or both. Their fears were removed and their wants were supplied just as if they had not sinned.

6. The next was a rebellion, an organized revolution, if not high treason—the worship of the golden calf while Moses was long in the mountain. It ignored the Theocratic covenant and planned another leadership amid the joyous festivities of idolatrous worship. We need not discuss details. The punishment by sword and plague was fearful though modified by Moses' intercession.

7. When three days out from Mount Sinai the "people

complained." It must have been an aggravated case for "the fire of the Lord burnt among them and consumed the uttermost parts of the camp." It was arrested by Moses' intercession. They called the place Taberah—burning.

8. At their first place or station of sojourn they became weary of the God-given manna and demanded the flesh-pots and vegetables of Egypt. We need not recount the bitterness of their wailings and lamentations, nor the quails given for a month, the gorging and the great plague. "They called the name of the place Kibroth-Hattaavah, because there they buried the people that lusted." Numb. Chapter 11.

9. At Hazeroth, the next station, Aaron and Miriam led a sedition against Moses. The Lord took up the case and dealt with the leaders, but they were forgiven at Moses' intercession. No wonder it was said, "Moses was meek above all the men which were on all the face of the earth."

The last four, just mentioned, seem to have had a political complexion, if we may judge by their origin and outcome.

10. The tenth was the crisis at Kadesh-barnea, which has been discussed in No. 62. Thus we have recounted the "ten times" that they "tempted" the Lord. Numb. 14:22.

11. The rebellion of Korath, Dathan and Abiram will be discussed in No. 65.

12. On their rendezvous at Kadesh at the end of 39 years the congregation (their national assembly) had insufficient water for themselves and their cattle and they made loud complaint against Moses and Aaron. Their complaint was so unreasonable that Moses was angered and sinned with his tongue and smote the rock

for water instead of speaking to it, as commanded, so that both he and Aaron were charged with rebellion. Numb. 20:24, and 27:14.

13. One more is mentioned. On their march from Mount Hor, on the borders of Edom and parallel to the Arabah, toward the sea road at Ezion-Gaber, they were "discouraged because of the way," and "they spake against God and against Moses, repeating their old complaints about bread and water. They were punished with the fiery serpents.

These are all the murmurings and rebellions mentioned in the history, but there may have been many more during the silent period of 38 years between Kadesh and the Arnon. Ps. 95:8-10.

No. 65.

KORAH, DATHAN AND ABIRAM.

Under the patriarchal system the first born became the civil and religious head of the house. He was the prophet, priest, and king of the family. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and Job were family priests and had the oracle by virtue of their priesthood. This made them prophets as well as priests. They offered sacrifices and instructed their children and dependents in divine truth, armed with sufficient authority to restrain and govern them. We need not argue this here.

As the family grew into a tribe they were subdivided into families. This system became unwieldly as population increased. So when the Hebrews reached Sinai the patriarchal system was greatly modified, though it was not abolished. The civil functions of the heads of families were transferred to an organized government with legislative, judicial and executive functions—tribal,

municipal, and federal. We need not argue this here. The priestly and prophetic functions of the first born—priesthood and oracle—were transferred to a priestly caste. The Lord took the males of the tribe of Levi for his own in place of the first born of the eleven other tribes. This seemed revolutionary in the extreme. They were stripped of the most precious heritage of the ages.

We need not be surprised therefore that this led to the worst and most stubborn of all their rebellions. It lasted three days and was led by the highest functionaries in the government. There was nothing like it in all their history. It was a heroic but misguided struggle, which collapsed only after repeated and terrific judgments.

Korath, Dathan and Abiram headed the rebellion of "two hundred and fifty princes of the Assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown." This was nearly half of their national Assembly. They rose up against Moses and Aaron and charged them with usurpation—"Ye take too much upon yourselves, seeing that all the congregation is holy, everyone of them is holy, and the Lord is among them, etc." They were not willing to transfer their priestly functions to the tribe of Levi.

Moses answered that the Lord would show on the morrow who were his and who were holy, and who might draw near to him in priestly function. Even the Levites were not willing that the actual priesthood should be limited to Aaron and his family, and joined numerously in the rebellion.

On the morrow he bade the two hundred and fifty princes to stand on one side with their censors, fire and incense, and Aaron with his censor on the other side. The story is familiar, how the earth opened and

swallowed up the three leaders and all that pertained to them; and fire from the Lord consumed the two hundred and fifty that offered incense. Surely this were enough.

But no. On the next day the remainder of the congregation met and charged Moses and Aaron with having killed the people of the Lord—so blinded were they with their rebellious fury. The plague started and was sweeping across the camp, and Aaron made haste with burning censor and stood between the living and the dead, and the plague was stayed. But 14,700 had already perished. They had all perished these two times, but for the intercessions of Moses and Aaron—themselves types of the prevailing intercession of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But the people were yet in no condition to see the full significance of these awful tests. The Lord in his mercy proposed a peaceable test which should settle the matter in dispute. The story of the thirteen rods laid up before the Lord is familiar—how Aaron's rod, the next morning had upon it buds and blossoms and almonds.

In the reaction and excitement, the people were seized with panic and terror lest all worship be dangerous and deadly. But Moses explained that Aaron and his sons assumed, with the office of priest, all the risk and danger of it.

No. 66.

EXTERMINATION OF THE CANAANITES.

Palestine was promised to Abraham and his seed by covenant, but not yet. "The iniquity of the Amorites was not yet full." Gen. 15:16. Four hundred years

must elapse ere they had sinned away their day of grace. Then Abraham's seed had become a nation of two and half millions. They received a commission to dispossess the seven condemned nations, each greater and mightier than they. They were bidden to smite and utterly destroy them and to show no mercy. Deut. 7:1–5.

Infidels have found in this history occasion to object and blaspheme. So-called higher critics have used it to discredit Old Testament morality, as belonging to a barbarous or semi-barbarous age. On the other hand it is applauded by tyrannical and bloodthirsty warriors in order to justify their ambition, greed, pillage and carnage.

All three of these classes are wrong, as will appear from several considerations.

1. God is the absolute ruler and judge of all the earth. He executes judgment and righteous judgment—on nations and peoples by whatever instrumentality seemeth good to him. The five cities of the plain were obliterated by fire and brimstone from heaven and none escaped. It was for their sins. Egypt, and Tyre, and Ninevah, and Babylon, and No Ammon attest, by their ruins today, the doom denounced against them by the prophets.

2. Bible history and prophecy unlock the mysteries of God's government of nations and peoples and vindicate its righteousness.

3. The seven condemned nations had sinned to the limits of God's patience. Their cup was full. The land was ready to vomit them out. Levit. 18:25–28.

4. A just and righteous sentence had been passed upon them. The Hebrews were appointed the executioners. Fire and sword were the appointed means, and the spoil was theirs.

5. The Lord promised to cast them out and to deliver

them into their hands to destroy utterly. Deut. 7:1, 2. He was the commander-in-chief of their armies—the "captain of the Lord's host." Jericho and Ai attest his presence, counsel and power. The sun and the moon and the hailstones were marshalled under Joshua's banner.

6. Tyrants and despots can take no comfort from this history for their unholy wars, for they have no divine commission, though they do often claim it.

No. 67.

THE GIANTS.

Gen. 6:4; Deut. 3:10–13; 2:10, 11, 20, 21; Numb. 13:28–33; Josh. 11:21; 14:15; 1 Sam. 17:4; 2 Sam. 21:15–22.

We read in Genesis that there were giants in the land in those days—the latter part of the antediluvian period when the whole earth was corrupting itself. Mighty men and men of renown, great warriors of gigantic force and prowess filled the whole earth with violence. These were no mere figures of speech nor figments of the imagination, as was once claimed.

The giant races after the Flood justify the generally accepted belief that the Antediluvians were of physical mold and development corresponding to their millennial constitution. Sin and the curse had not yet cut down their stature and their average duration of life to later degenerate standards.

We learn from Moses and Joshua that giant races play no unimportant part among the peoples of Palestine from the days of Abraham and before down to the days of David.

The critics would still consign these giants to the mythical limbus of Hercules, Vulcan and Cyclops but for one thing.—the imperishable ruins of their cities remain to this day.

We hear of them first when Cherdolaomer and his confederates reduced to tribute the Emims, the Zuzims and the Zamzumims on the east of Jordan. Afterwards, two centuries or more, the Moabites and the Ammonites drove them northward, and later the Amorites drove them still further north into Bashan or Gilead, leaving some of their people among the conquering Amorites. There Moses found them and literally exterminated them.

At a much earlier day, before the time of Abraham, they were no doubt a part of the Hittite, or Hykso, confederacy that invaded Egypt and held sway so long. For one Arba, a giant, founded Kiriath-Arba, the city of Arba (Hebron), seven years before the founding of Zoan, their capital in Egypt till near the birth of Moses. Hebron and the regions round about were their homes for centuries under the general name of Anakims.

In Abraham's day Hebron was still a Hittite city, and was long the Palestinian capital of the Hittite confederacy, of which the Hittites were an integral and prominent part. This confederacy consisted of many peoples so bound together for offence and defence that they were a great world power for a thousand years.

It is hardly necessary to mention the part the giants played in the report of the spies sent from Kadesh-barnea and the resulting disasters to Israel.

Joshua's last campaign in his seven year wars was against the giants who at that time occupied all the mountains of Judah and Israel with Hebron, Debir, and Anab as their principal cities. He exterminated them.

Only a few remained in the Philistine cities, military adventurers, due to perish as the centuries advanced. In fact, they were one of the seven peoples condemned to extermination under the general name Amorites, mountaineers.

Goliath perished by the hand of David, and his three brothers, the last of their race, perished in battle, slain by David's three mighty men.

Og and Goliath were two typical giants. Og's iron bedstead was nine cubits long and four cubits wide—a war trophy; and we have a full description of Goliath's armor.

Noah Porter carefully explored the ruins of their cities and their civilization and has published the results under the title, "Giant Cities of Bashan." He tells us that standing at one point he could see the remains of thirty cities—stone walls, stone doorways, stone beds, stone drinking vessels and other household utensils, all of gigantic size and weight.

Many questions might emerge here, and might be answered in a speculative way, but it is neither legitimate nor safe to go beyond the record.

No. 68.

THE JUDGES.

The period of Jewish history between Joshua and the establishment of the kingdom is called the period of the Judges. Its history is found in the Book of Judges and in the first seven chapters of First Samuel.

These judges were not a judiciary except as the chief magistrate exercised judicial functions. They are called judges for want of a better name. They must not be

confounded with the Shophetim or judges of the tribal or federal judiciary.

There were twelve of these judges down to Samuel, with interregna between. It was not a permanent office. They were extraordinary officers, divinely called and qualified in great emergencies to deliver the people from their enemies and oppressors. They were great military leaders and deliverers, and remained the civil heads of the commonwealth for life.

They were officers much like Moses and Joshua, both in call and function, and probably their actual successors. They were led by the spirit of God, and were divinely directed both in their military campaigns and in their civil administrations, and besides, they were men of strong theocratic faith. They were not perfect men, but they were properly classed by Paul in his long list of Old Testament worthies—his "great cloud of witnesses," presented for our imitation and emulation.

No. 69.

JEPHTHAH'S VOW.

We need not recount his campaign and victory over the Philistines and the Ammonites and the deliverance he wrought through faith. We are told that the "Spirit of the Lord came upon Jephthah" and he "vowed a vow unto the Lord, and said, If thou shalt without fail deliver the children of Ammon into mine hands, then it shall be that whatsoever cometh of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall be the Lord's or (marg. ref.) I will offer it up for a burnt offering." We can hardly suppose that he would offer as a burnt offering any unsuitable victim, forbidden by Jewish law and usage; but any

animal or person (whatsoever) might be given to the Lord by vow. His daughter met him—his only child, in whom was his only hope of posterity. His faith was staggered, but was at once reinforced by the faith and acquiescence of his daughter. She said, "Let this thing be done for me." But she asked for two months to bewail her virginity with her sympathetic friends. She could never become a mother because she was to be devoted to tabernacle service. Was such service customary? We learn in Numb. chap. 31 that thirty-two virgins were the Lord's tithe of the captive virgins of Midian. Eli's sons defiled the "women that did service (rev. ver.) at the door of the tabernacle." The vestal virgins of pagan Rome and other countries were evident imitations of Hebrew usage.

We are told also that "she knew no man," and we are also told that it was a "custom in Israel." Besides this, "The daughters of Israel went yearly to lament(to condole with) the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite four days in the year." Judges 11:39, 40.

We need only to change a comma to a period and leave out the word "that" (inserted by the translators) and we have the statement as quoted.

It has been largely held that Jephthah offered his daughter for a burnt offering—a human sacrifice. How was it possible? The Spirit of the Lord came upon him and he made his vow which was made in due form and accepted.

More than this. Paul in Heb. 11 includes Jephthah in the list of Old Testament worthies who through a heroic theocratic faith "subdued kingdoms" and "wrought righteousness." Could Paul have been mistaken? Was Jephthah a rude, ignorant, semi-barbarous exile chieftain, who vowed rashly, and burned his daughter, a

human sacrifice, in imitation of the worshippers of Moloch, and that among a people still so debased that they made a hero of him? It is enough that Paul counted him a hero of faith.

No. 70.

LEPROSY.

This disease was prevalent in Moses' day, and still prevails in the east and in parts of Europe and Oceanica. Aeschylus describes its fearful ravages on the human body. Hyppocrates and Celsus describe three kinds—two of them curable in the early stages, but the third seldom cured.

Moses seems to describe three or four kinds, for the direction of the high priest in his diagnosis of the disease for the purpose of quarantine. There were several other skin diseases so much like leprosy in its earlier stages that it required time and expert diagnosis to decide upon the difference. He decided whether a case was contagious or non-contagious. If contagious, the patient was sent to a leprous community outside of the town or city, just as we see in the east to-day. If non-contagious, the high priest gave a clean bill of health.

Whenever a leper claimed to have recovered the high priest made a careful investigation, and if he were cured, he issued a clean bill of health after the most careful sanitation and after certain purifying rites.

The contagious forms of leprosy speedily developed into sores of more or less malignity. Many of them were curable in the earlier stages, but became incurable after long standing. So it is to-day. The popular impression that all leprosy is incurable is not true, though the treatment seems to have been largely lost. When

Christ cured the ten lepers by the wayside he sent them to the priest for a clean bill of health as a matter of common usage. They evidently belonged to a separate community of the contagious type. And Christ healed many others.

The leprosy of Miriam, Numb. 12:10, was of this type. So also the four lepers when Benhadad besieged Samaria. 2 Kings, 7:3. King Uzziah's leprosy was of the same sort, 2 Chron. 26:20, for he lived in a separate house until he died.

The non-contagious variety had no sores and caused little or no discomfort to the subject. It seemed to consist in an unnatural whiteness of the skin—a glistening and scaliness of the skin in spots, extending ofttimes over the entire body.

It was very offensive to the eyes of the beholder, and was considered a great affliction. The subject continued to live with his family and even to fill high civil and military office, as was the case with Naaman, the Syrian. 2 Kings 5:1. Gehazi was punished with the same leprosy "as white as snow." Yet he continued to serve his master, Elisha, and later on was interviewed by the king who asked him to tell him of Elisha's wonderful miracles. Moses' leprous hand "white as snow" was no doubt of the same kind. Simon the leper who entertained Christ and the Twelve was doubtless of the same class. Compare Levit. 13:12, 13.

These simple statements are sufficient to remove misapprehensions concerning leprosy. There is no evidence from the Scriptures that leprosy had any spiritual significance. It is sometimes argued elaborately that it is the type of sin. It falls under no definition of a type any more than fever or palsy or any other disease.

Types were fulfilled or done away with by the Gospel. Leprosy remains.

It is not amiss to illustrate the deadly character of sin by comparing it to a malignant leprosy or indeed to any other deadly disease. This is perhaps all that is meant when they call it a type, loosely, for a mere figure of speech.

No. 71.

THE BIBLE STATUS OF WAR.

The Bible draws the curtain a little aside and we get a single view of the antediluvian world in its most degenerate period. "There were giants on the earth in those days"—"mighty men"—"men of renown"—"great warriors." "The earth was filled with violence." Their wickedness, corruption and violence made the race mutual executioners. The waters of the Flood finished the work. Gen. 6:1–13. We see no redeeming features in those wars. Ambition, lust, spoil and carnage were their inspiration.

Such wars have been supremely wicked in all ages since. War seems to have been the normal condition of nations and peoples. Peace was only a truce with no permanent intent, or else it was conquest, submission, spoliation and slavery. Caesar's "Omni Gallia Pacata" sounds like a grim witticism. "Therion," a wild beast, is the Bible name (in prophecy) of the great world powers, because they have rent and torn each other like wild beasts, crunching the very bones of the weak and helpless.

Per contra, the Bible promises a time to come, "when they shall learn war no more"—"when they shall beat

their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks"—"when they shall not hurt nor destroy in all his holy mountain." This is Messianic prophecy and will be fulfilled by the power of the Gospel on the hearts of men.

Modern sentimentalism has undertaken this reformation. But its inspiration is "gain," not "godliness." Its arguments are economic and commercial with a holy horror of blood. Its leadership is a remarkable trio and it is financed with "tainted money." There is no Christ in it though it assumes to wear the livery of heaven.

Sentimentalism deals in half truths and, for lack of ballast, degenerates into a malignant fanaticism. It were easy to prove this proposition from history. Crusades, ancient and modern, were born here.

Many of our sentiments are of noble origin and give birth to many generous impulses, but sentimentalism in alliance with utilitarianism presents many base counterfeits of "the true, the beautiful and the good." A superadded hypocrisy enables a despot, a skeptic and a unitarian to work in the same team.

The most superficial student of history must see that there have been righteous and unrighteous wars. Wickedness, on one side or the other, has been behind most wars, accentuated by jealousies, misunderstandings and mutual distrust.

More than this. Truth and righteousness have been crushed to the earth under the heel of the despot on the one hand, while on the other the noblest rights of the race have been vindicated by gigantic and heroic struggles.

The modern reformer decries all war and would substitute mutual surrenders, compromises, and arbitration courts for the arbitrament of the sword. He quotes,

"war is hell," and concludes that nothing is worth fighting for. This at least is the logic of his argument.

But it is no easy matter to set aside the traditions of the race. They are apt to be right though often abused. They are presumably of divine origin and sanction and can only be set aside by a "thus saith the Lord."

What then is the Bible status of war? The following considerations answer the question almost without comment.

1. The sword is a terror to evil-doers and is so ordained of God, to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Rom. 13:4, 5.

2. To wield the sword is the function of the magistrate from the lowest official to the chief magistrate of a nation.

3. Joash was rebuked for failure to smite the Syrians sufficiently. 2 Kings 13:19. Ahab was denounced for sparing Ben-hadad. 1 Kings 20:31–42. God requires fidelity in the use of the sword in righteous war.

4. The war of Abraham and his confederates against the five conquering kings was righteous, for Melchizedek, a priest of the Most High, blessed him on his return and received a tithe of the spoil.

5. Moses' wars east of the Jordan began in self-defense and, ended, in absolute conquest and spoliation under divine leadership—so also his Midianite war.

6. Joshua's campaigns on the west of the river were divinely ordered and executed under the Lord's counsel and leadership.

7. The twelve judges were military heroes divinely called, and commissioned to deliver Israel out of the hands of their oppressors.

8. When David had slain the Philistine and the women sung and danced, with tabrets and instruments of music,

and tossed their chorus back and forth, they did but express the innate loyalty of every honest heart to the true military hero.

9. David's wars of conquest and reprisal which pushed the borders of his kingdom to their covenanted limits were hardly to be condemned, for the conquering king was made the supreme type of our true king who shall subdue all things unto himself.

10. Every nation or people has always been recognized as the final arbiter and judge, for war or for peace, except as overawed or restrained by superior power. It could hardly be otherwise.

11. The laws of war as promulgated by Moses were God-given and may not be criticized, and they need no defense. Still the modern sentimentalist denounces them as cruel, unmerciful and semi-barbaric.

12. The sentimentalist overlooks the doctrine of representation and imputation, by which every man, woman and child from the king in the palace to the peasant in the hovel, and even the beasts of the field and the products of the soil, are liable to the fortunes of war. No class is exempt from the visitations of war, or famine, or pestilence, though all may not equally suffer.

13. The terms "civilized warfare," "laws of warfare," "noncombatants' rights," "international law" and "arbitration courts" are a delusion unless the sword be behind to enforce them.

14. When sin entered into the universe of God, war came with it. Michael and his angels fought against the devil and his angels. When sin entered Eden the earth became the theatre of war—not a figurative war of abstract ideas—not a mere conflict of good and evil as opposing forces. It was and is and has been an actual war of bloody battlefields—men warring against men,

kingdom against kingdom. It has been a war of varying fortunes and the end is not yet. Michael and his angels still fight the Devil and his angels on this arena.

15. A false philosophy underlies this sentimentalism; to wit: All punishments are remedial, and not vindictive, and must be administered as gently as possible, with all appropriate anodynes and anesthetics of human invention.

No. 72.

DAVID, THE SHEPHERD LAD.

When Saul sinned twice—official sins—the Spirit of the Lord departed from him and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him. David, the son of Jesse, was sought out to play on the harp and exorcise the evil spirit whenever he was troubled. He was the youngest son and had charge of his father's flocks. When not needed by Saul he returned to Bethlehem to feed his father's sheep.

There is a general impression that he was a mere lad when first called and, a little later, fought the giant, perhaps sixteen of eighteen years old, a mere stripling. He has been represented by painters and commentators as a bright boy, in shepherd garb, who had a taste for music, and had improved the idle hours of his calling by playing on his harp and throwing stones with his sling, as any other boy might do. It has also been suggested that he was put in charge of the sheep in order that his more manly brothers might go to war and drive out the enemy. Is this estimate just? It is strange that so many mistakes have been made.

1. He must have been about twenty-seven years old, in the full vigor of his young manhood. Saul seems to have reigned about seven years, and he was called to

Saul about the middle of his reign, about three years before his death, and he was made king of Judah when he was thirty years old.

2. His reputation was already made when Saul called for him. 1 Sam. 16:18. Note the sketch. "He was a mighty valiant man, and a man of war." Who will say that he was not skilled in all the modes of ancient warfare and familiar with all its weapons?

He was "prudent in matters." His wisdom as a counsellor was already recognized and indicated that he was already a prominent official in his tribe—a man of weight, to say the least of it.

He was skilled with the harp and the "Lord was with him." He was already the inspired poet and the sweet singer of Israel. Some of his psalms were doubtless written before he became king. If he also sung the songs of Zion with his harp in hand, we need not wonder that the evil spirit fled for a season.

He was also "a comely person." His manly beauty along with his glorious victories won him the hearts of the "women out of every city" to sing his praises.

He had already been anointed king by Samuel. 1 Sam. 16:1–13.

3. His personal prowess had been vindicated when once a lion, and then a bear attacked his sheep, and he slew them both. We may now understand why he had been put in charge of his father's wealth instead of those stalwart, mocking and jealous brothers who trembled with fright at the daily challenge of Goliath.

4. He was a man of tried and triumphant faith. He said to Saul, The Lord "will deliver me out of the hand of this Philistine," and to the Philistine, "I come to thee in the name of the Lord of Hosts. 1 Sam. 17:37, 45-48.

5. When he played before Saul, he made him his armor bearer, a place for the bravest of the brave. He also made David stand before him as his chief favorite. These two positions made him chief counsellor.

6. The armies of the ancients consisted of heavy armed and light armed troops. The light armed were archers and slingers who fought at a distance and hurled their missiles with great precision. David was too wise to put on Saul's heavy armor, which did not fit him anyway, and fight the giant in hand to hand conflict. He entered the arena with shepherd staff and garb and with no weapon in sight. The giant was so angered that he doubtless threw up the visor of his helmet in order to curse him. David denounced his doom and ran forward and planted a stone from his sling in his brow and the stone sunk into his forehead. Here met courage, skill and faith.

7. "Saul took him from that day and would let him go no more home to his father's house." "And Saul set him over the men of war," and he executed wisely all difficult commissions. 1 Sam. 18:1-5.

8. It is true that Saul called him a "young man" which is the equivalent of "soldier" or "warrior." He also called him a "youth" because he was under size and "ruddy and of a fair countenance," and "of a beautiful countenance." 1 Sam. 17:42.

No. 73.

DAVID AND JONATHAN.

The friendship of David and Jonathan will be quoted till the end of time as the highest type of human friendship. "The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul."

There are instinctive friendships born of conditions and mutual relations. Such are family ties and the reciprocal affections of neighbors and associates. These are disrupted more or less easily by selfishness or by clashing interests. They are not grounded in moral worth.

Then there are sentimental friendships originating in artificial conditions and associations, community of aims or tastes, or in some popular rallying cry expressed by mottoes and regalia. Societies, clubs and leagues derive all their cohesion from these sources. Such friendships are ephemeral and liable to rapid changes. They are not grounded in noble distinctions.

This friendship of David and Jonathan was a product of the soul. It was based on true moral worth, and on their mutual recognition of it and love of it. Their souls were knit together, as if every fibre of each was interwoven into the other. Or, to change the figure, the whole was cemented together with an undying affection. No matter of self interest, rivalry or jealousy found its way between them, though their relations were delicate and even antagonistic according to usual standards.

Jonathan is usually considered the hero of this friendship, for he seemed to make every possible sacrifice of personal and family interest for David's sake, even to the risk of life itself. Still he was not a traitor to his father, nor was David.

We may name one more common bond in this unique friendship—absolute loyalty to God and unwavering faith in his promises and purposes. This makes the perfection of friendship.

It is not safe to press types too far lest we teach a fanciful typology. But it would seem that this holy friendship foreshadowed the holy friendship of Christ

and his people. He calls us friends. He laid down his life for his friends. "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you."

No. 74.

DAVID AND SAUL.

David's loyalty to Saul seems under all the circumstances to be a marvel. Several considerations enter into the problem.

1. The most obvious fact was David's persistent purpose to return good for evil when Saul again and again sought his life. Saul recognized this twice, at least, when David and his men might easily have slain him. He even wept and said to David, "Thou art more righteous than I," because he had rewarded good for evil.

2. He was loyal to Saul as his lawful king—the Lord's anointed. He would not lift a hand against him though the provocation was very great.

3. As a patriot he was unwilling to plunge his people into civil war. Numbers flocked to his standard while in hiding, but he would not allow them to strike a single blow. His great popularity would have insured him easy success if he had raised the standard of revolt.

4. He knew that the kingdom was to be taken from Saul, and Samuel had anointed him to be his successor. But he chose to bide his time in fullness of faith and loyalty to the Lord, whose viceroy he should be when he became king.

5. He fully understood the nature and the cause of Saul's trouble with the evil spirit and did all he could to alleviate his unfortunate condition as long as it was safe to play before him, or to perform the duties of his position as the highest public functionary, both civil and

military. All his subsequent movements were in the interest of his personal safety.

6. Saul was his father-in-law, and he was ever a true and loyal son. Michal was his beloved wife and Jonathan his dearest friend. And he sware both to Saul and to Jonathan to be kind to their children when he became king.

Such was David: kind, generous, forgiving, faithful, brave, patriotic, loyal to his king, a devoted son, a matchless friend, and of abiding faith. No wonder Samuel said, "The Lord hath sought him a man after his own heart." 1 Sam. 13:14; Acts 13:22.

Yet men find fault and blaspheme because David sinned grievously. They forget that he repented with a depth of sorrow and broken hearted anguish such as only a noble and generous soul can feel. "Let him that is without sin cast the first stone."

What may we say of Saul? It has been common to paint his character in the darkest colors. Is this just? Ought we not to cast the mantle of charity over him and many others, so far at least, as the Scriptures may justify?

1. He was a man of great physical size and strength—"a choice young man"—"none goodlier than he." He had charge of his father's herds even after he was anointed king.

2. Kish, his father, was a "mighty man of power". So also was his son, chosen as he was of God and elected by the people to lead their armies. The Lord chose him, and "there was none like him among all the people." 1 Sam. 9:1; 10:24.

3. He was conspicuous for his modesty and for his lack of personal ambition. This is indicated by his protest of unworthiness when Samuel first anointed him

in Zuph, and also by his hiding himself when the people came together at Mizpeh to elect a king.

4. After his first anointing he met a company of prophets and he joined them in their ecstasies. As he left Samuel "God gave him another heart," and on the way the "Spirit of the Lord came upon him and he prophesied" and he was "turned into another man."

What does all this mean? The special presence of the Spirit and the prophesying were evidently temporary. 1 Sam. 10:5-13. The terms "another heart," and "another man" would indicate permanent change. What was it? Some think it was an inwrought equipment for the position he was about to fill—an equipment, intellectual, moral, and social, similar to Solomon's gift of wisdom. There is but little evidence of this from the subsequent history.

These terms, "another heart" and "another man," seem to be equivalent to similar terms found both in the Old and New Testaments, to wit: a "new heart," a "new creature," the "new man," a "right spirit" and such like; all of which is accomplished by the "washing of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Ghost." While we may not be absolutely sure that this is the meaning of the terms there is nothing in the history to militate against it.

4. His two official sins were his failure to exterminate the Amalekites, and his offering a burnt offering which was the function of a priest. In these he seems to have yielded to the pressure of the people. They cost him his kingdom and also his life. The distinction between personal sins and official sins under the theocracy is obvious.

5. He was further punished by an evil spirit—a clear case of a possession of a devil. He was not possessed all

the time, but the evil spirit seemed to come and go at pleasure. How far a man so possessed was responsible for what he did we may not determine.

6. His deeds of cruelty and his persecutions of David were inspired by jealousy and suspicion, intensified by the evil spirit, and much of his conduct would probably be accounted for to-day as varying insanity or as analogous to it.

7. David's song after the tragedy at Gilboa gives his estimate of the man. "How are the mighty fallen." "Ye daughters of Israel, weep over Saul, who clothed you in scarlet, etc." "Saul and Jonathan were lovely and pleasant in their lives and in their death they were not divided. They were swifter than eagles, they were stronger than lions." These words may not be set down to the account of poetic license and exaggeration. David evidently covered all his wrongdoing with the mantle of charity, and so may we. 2 Sam. 1:18–27.

No. 75.

DAVID AND THE AMMONITES.

When Nahash, king of the Ammonites, besieged the city of Jabesh Gilead he was driven back by Saul in the first year of his reign. During Saul's persecutions of David, Nahash seems to have done some great kindness for which David was duly grateful. When Nahash died David sent messengers to Hanun, his son, to comfort him and express his kindly sympathy, and to renew the kindly relations of the two kingdoms.

But Hanun put insults and indignities upon the messengers. David was so angered that he declared war on the Ammonites. They hired the Syrians as allies, but David defeated their armies in three campaigns and

the Syrians made their submission to him. Joab then laid siege to Rabbath Ammon, their capital city on the headwaters of the Arnon. He took the city proper and sent for David to bring additional forces and lead the army in the capture of the citadel, so as to claim the glory. It was during this siege that Davis committed his two great sins.

He took the city and a great abundance of spoil. They discrowned their king and crowned David as their king. 2 Sam. 12:30. This would indicate the submission of the Ammonites on the usual terms of allegiance and tribute. The annual tribute paid to David from the Euphrates to the Red Sea by conquered nations was enormous, and was continued under the reign of Solomon.

The wealth of the Ammonites must have been very great, for the crown they placed on David's head weighed a talent of gold with precious stones. All the cities of the Ammonites made their submission along with the capital.

The garrison of the citadel who resisted so long seem to have fared the worst, as is usual in such cases. What was their fate? There are two opinions. One is that they were put to death in every form of barbaric cruelty —cut and torn with saws and axes and harrows of iron, and burned in the fires of the brick-kiln. 2 Sam. 12:31; 1 Chron. 20:3. And he dealt so with all their cities.

If the translation of these passages is correct David was guilty of wholesale cruelties and tortures, which in their accumulations were far more criminal than the sins which were reproved by Nathan, the prophet. Such treatment was so contrary to David's habitual generosity, and so contrary to the policy of his kingdom that we feel justified in raising the question, whether these translations are correct.

The other translations would say, He caused them to cut (labor) with saws, axes and harrows and to do service in brick moulding (or brick work). Compare Jer. 43:9 and Nah. 3:14; where the "brick-kiln" is "brick work" with "mortar," and ought to be so rendered.

If the verbs used are causatives and not mere transitives, as the author believes, then we readily see that the garrisons were put under tribute of service with the usual regulations, as was so common in that day.

This solution puts the case of the Ammonites in line with David's policy in dealing with a number of other conquered nations. Tribute of service was as common as tribute of money and agricultural products, especially in building palaces, founding and fortifying cities and other great public works.

No. 76.

WITCHCRAFT.

We find in 1 Chron. 10:13, 14 two reasons for Saul's disastrous death, disobedience and witchcraft. These two sins were regarded as equally heinous. 1 Sam. 15:23.

Moses' law says "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Ex. 22:18; Deut. 18:10. "A wizard shall surely be put to death." Levit. 20:27. The man or the woman that dealt in witchcraft was said to have a "familiar spirit," and was often called a familiar spirit, Levit. 19:31, and numerously. The man who consulted the witch was also to be cut off. Levit. 20:6.

Jezebel and Manasseh were conspicuous for their witchcrafts. 2 Kings 9:22; 2 Chron. 33:6. It were easy to show that whoredoms and idolatries were the twin sisters of witchcraft. Nahum 3:4. Who says that these were Old Testament superstitions? Paul says "The

works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, *witchcraft* and so on."

It is not our purpose to vindicate the Mosaic law—God's law— in dealing with witchcraft, except to note, "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" Nor is it our purpose to determine how much of truth or falsehood there may have been in the pretenses and practices of witchcraft.

Witchcraft is based on a universal belief in the supernatural and especially in the existence of a spirit world, —spirits of higher or lower orders, and especially the souls or spirits of the dead who once lived on the earth. It professes to communicate with this spirit world, and especially with departed spirits, and to receive a great variety of manifestations and revelations from them.

We find it in all nations and peoples in many forms and under a variety of names, Witchcraft, Necromancy, Sorcery, Magic, Soothsaying, Occultism, Divination and Spiritualism.

While witchcraft is not a religious cult it has always been in close alliance with all forms of paganism. Priestcraft has used it freely to control its votaries through their superstitious fears of the supernatural.

Witchcraft plays upon these fears till they become abject terrors, and men become more afraid of the dead than of the living. The witch herself becomes the mediator of the supernatural powers and herself becomes the embodiment of the powers of evil. Enchantments, evil-eye and hoodoo are her weapons, until charms and countercharms control the destinies of all around them.

If there be any truth and reality in it no test of it has yet been discovered, and no way invented to differentiate its lying wonders. But suppose it to be true and

real in its main contentions, it is flagrant sin, according to Moses and according to Paul.

And if it be a system of lies and delusions wrought and fostered in order to terrorize and rob and spoil and destroy its victims, and to unsettle the foundations of society, it incurs a deeper damnation. Assassination and poison have been the facile tools of witchcraft, and no life is safe where the witch holds sway. It has been claimed that among certain peoples five-tenths and even seven-tenths of the population perish by witchcraft.

No wonder that witchcraft has so often perished by its own weapons. No wonder that terrorized populations have sometimes risen in fanatical fury against their destroyers.

Modern spiritualism seems so far to be satisfied with deceiving the unwary and the ignorant for the sake of the money of their victims. From this it is an easy step to the highwayman's formula, "your money or your life." Gain was the inspiration of witchcraft in Paul's day. Simon Magus and Elymas got great gain by their sorceries.

Satan's connection with these things is recognized, but not well defined. The damsel at Philippi was a clear case of demoniacal possession and was so far Satanic. Paul makes mention of Satan's power, signs and lying wonders, wrought by and through his votaries. The manipulators of witchcraft have not been slow to claim satanic co-operation and absolute control over all the forces of evil.

The literature of the "Curious Arts" was enormous. At Corinth the converted votaries brought their books and burned them—books worth fifty thousand pieces of silver.

No. 77.

TRIAL BY ORDEAL. THE DUELLO.

The "ordeal" was an arbitrary form of trial to determine guilt or innocence when evidence was lacking. The truth or falsity of suspicions or of slanderous charges was often determined by ordeal. The issue of guilt or innocence was divinely settled and was so accepted. It was practiced in Europe in ruder times, and is still practiced in Africa and Asia.

In England there were ordeals by fire and water. If the criminal could handle a red hot iron, or walk blindfolded and barefoot around red hot plow shares spread on the ground unhurt, he was adjudged innocent, otherwise, guilty. They also practiced two modes of ordeal by water.

Ordeals by poison, by decoctions, either neutral or irritant, by foods and drinks and by a variety of dangerous devices have been practiced in many parts of the world. The victim seldom had any show for his life unless he had some friend to manipulate the details of the trial in his interest. Trial by ordeal and witchcraft have been in close alliance. Hate, revenge, cupidity and superstition have been their inspiration.

In Moses' law there was one provision for trial by ordeal. It was to be conducted by the high priest with the most solemn and impressive religious sanctions before the Lord—an offering, a charge, an oath, curses invoked, and a possible issue worse than death. Numb. 5:12–31. Its object was to protect family virtue and to vindicate the virtuous wife from unfounded suspicions and jealousies.

The suspected wife was given an innocent decoction called "Bitter water." No harm came of it to the

virtuous wife, but a guilty woman became a loathsome curse among her people. The Lord presided at the ordeal and issued the verdict. We may fairly infer from verse 31 that a jealous and suspicious husband resorted to the ordeal at serious risk of divine displeasure to himself.

The use of the lot for divine revelation in cases like Achan and Jonah seem to have been the analogue of trial by ordeal if it were not, indeed, essentially the same.

THE DUELLO.

This has been another form of trial by ordeal. The case of Goliath and David was national rather than personal. The giant stood forth, the champion of his people, and challenged Israel to send a champion to fight him in single combat, and so determine the destinies of the two peoples. David took up the gauntlet in the name of the Lord in full reliance on his God. Goliath cursed him in the name of his gods. The Lord settled it and the Philistines were pursued with terrific slaughter, not daring to raise a hand against the God of Israel.

In the wars of David and Abner they made an effort to settle their quarrel by a duello of twelve on each side. But it proved a failure, for they all fell down dead in the conflict.

The early history of Rome tells of the duello of the Horatii and the Curatii which made peace between the Romans and the Latins and ended in the mutual absorption of the two peoples.

During the days of knight-errantry and chivalry in Europe the duel was made popular and its code was sanctioned by kings and nobles, popes and ecclesiastics for the settlement of all questions of personal honor, ladies

fair, feudal fealty, political aspirations, and deliverance of the oppressed. The knight's good sword and spear claimed the divine blessing when wielded for the right and the arbitrament of the sword was accepted as the voice of God. There was much to admire in the chivalrous vow which consecrated self and wealth and the good broad-sword to country, to woman and to God.

That creed is now exploded but the duel still remains, the residuum, the dregs of mistaken nobility. Its sole watchword to-day is "personal honor," which is but the euphemistic name for selfishness, pride, jealousy, hate, private revenge and murder.

It has been extensively held that war is ordeal by the sword. Holy wars, such as the crusades and the Moslem conquests, were based on this principle, that God fights on the side of the right, and that the issue determines the righteousness of a cause. The victorious despot has often boasted that he had a divine call and commission to punish and even destroy his infidel and sinning foes. And many a fallen foe has lost his faith in God because the right had been trampled under foot by the oppressor.

The whole theory is vicious. It is nowhere taught in the Scriptures that the arbitrament of the sword determines the righteousness or the unrighteousness of any cause.

No. 78.

HIRAM, KING OF TYRE.

In ancient warfare conquered peoples were sometimes deported and settled in other localities for political reasons. The captivities of Israel and Judah and the resettlement of Palestine present cases of this sort.

Sometimes the conquered peoples were driven out and were absolutely dispossessed of their lands, towns and cities, which were then occupied by their conquerors. The removals of the Moabites and the Ammonites were evidently cases of this kind.

Sometimes conquered peoples were allowed to retire and carry their possessions with them and found new settlements, dispossessing in their turn, weaker peoples. The migrations of the Greek peoples from Asia Minor along the Mediterranean as far west as Spain were of this character. So also the "treking" of the Boers in recent years.

After the Flood, Central Asia from the Persian Gulf northward along the Euphrates and the Tigris was settled by the Shemites, the descendants of Eber, and the more mobile Joktanite tribes. The sons of Ham settled Palestine, Egypt, Arabia and Abyssinia (Cush).

In the course of time the Cushites crossed the Persian Gulf and conquered Central Asia, most probably under Nimrod, and occupied Babylon and other cities.

The Shemites retired northward and then westward, settling Assyria and Syria, and occupying Palestine and Phoenicia, largely dispossessing the descendants of Ham. The Phoenicians, who were a maritime people on the Persian Gulf, took possession of Tyre and Sidon and a narrow strip of country on the Mediterranean and became a great seafaring people, establishing their commercial stations and cities as far west as Britain.

From this migration on down the history, these Phoenicians sustained the most intimate relations with the Hebrew peoples until the overthrow of both by Nebuchadnezzar.

The descendants of Shem seem to have preserved the true religion and worship within constantly narrowing

limits. The history of the influence of the later Hebrews —from Moses to Daniel—on other peoples has not yet been written.

How shall we account for Hiram, king of Tyre? His reign overlapped the reigns of David and Solomon. He was in the most intimate commercial and personal relations to them both. Was he a pagan product, or was he a worshipper of the Lord? Were his people idolatrous pagans? The data with which to answer these questions are scant, but they all seem to point one way.

1. They were Shemites, many of whom are monotheists to this day. The influence of Israel would tend to perpetuate their original worship.

2. We are told that the name of the God of the Phoenicians was Shaddai, "the Almighty," just as in Israel.

3. We are told that Hiram "was a lover of David" and "he rejoiced greatly over his son Solomon." 1 Kings 5:1, 8. And it would seem that he had a palace built for David as a pledge of his affection. 2 Sam. 5:11; 1 Chron. 14:1.

4. Hiram said "Blessed be the Lord this day, which hath given unto David a wise son over this great people." This was worship of Jehovah, pure and simple.

5. Hiram's wonderful generosity points in the same direction. He not only refused to accept from Solomon a strip of country with twelve cities to be added to his domain, but he sent to Solomon six score talents of gold.

6. There is no evidence to show that Hiram's people were idolaters up to this time. But the presumption is that the religion of their king and his court was also the religion of the state and people.

7. Rapid changes, however, took place in both peoples within less than a century. Eth-Baal of Tyre and Ahab of Israel mark an epoch of apostasy. The very names of

Jezebel, Athaliah and Dido tell the story of its enormous wickedness. Just as the two peoples had been mutually helpful for good, so they became mutually helpful for evil.

8. Seventy years of judgment were denounced against Tyre just as against Judah and Israel, and ostensibly for the same reason, apostasy from God. Is. chap. 23.

No. 79.

AHAB AND JEZEBEL.

We need not discuss here the sin of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, except to say that the kingdom of Israel was not apostate, but they worshipped the Lord with modified and forbidden forms which lasted with some interruptions till the captivity.

The dynasty of Jeroboam was exterminated for these modifications. Baasha usurped the kingdom but maintained the traditions of Jeroboam, and his dynasty was in turn exterminated by Omri, who secured the kingdom after six years of civil war. Omri in turn adhered to the traditions of the kingdom and made them worse than ever. He reigned twelve years and was succeeded by his son Ahab.

Up to this time there was no apostasy and there was no worship of false gods in Israel as there had been in Judah during the reign of Rehoboam and his son. And Ahab in turn followed the policy of the kingdom, and there is no evidence that he ever apostatized from the faith though he failed in maintaining it.

In the meanwhile the Phoenicians had apostatized wholly, and Eth-Baal, their king, worshipped Baal and was himself the high priest of Astarte, and their vile and lewd orgies were the religion of the state.

Ahab well-nigh ruined his kingdom when he took to wife Jezebel, the daughter of Eth-Baal. She was the typical bad woman of the Bible. Rev. 2:20. Under her influence he built a temple to Baal and an altar in Samaria, and she stirred him up to do evil.

She maintained four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal and four hundred prophets of Astarte, and was herself High Priestess of this double worship, taking the lead in its whoredoms and witchcrafts. She crowned her crimes with the judicial murder of Naboth and the confiscation of his vineyard, and slew four hundred prophets of the Lord.

But Ahab was no weakling in the hands of his wicked wife as is commonly supposed. He reigned twenty-two years and was distinguished in the arts of war and of peace. He conducted three campaigns against the Syrians. He built a palace of ivory, and he founded and beautified a number of cities.

It is likely that Jezebel committed many of his crimes as queen regent when he was engaged in war or otherwise occupied. He evidently conserved and protected the traditional worship of Jehovah, while patronizing the gods of his wife. So did his son Ahaziah. 1 Kings 22:51-53. Solomon had set the example long before.

He retained Obadiah, who "feared the Lord greatly," near his person—"over his house"—probably his chief counsellor. He accepted the decision at Mt. Carmel as the basis of a general reformation among his people, and we see no evidence of a general relapse.

When Elijah pronounced the doom of Ahab, of Jezebel and of his house on account of Naboth the Jezreelite—that crowning crime— he rent his clothes, put on sackcloth, and fasted and wept sore. The Lord told Elijah

that his repentance was accepted and the sentence would not be executed in his days.

If this was repentance unto life, as we can but hope and believe, it is no stranger than the repentance and acceptance of any other sinner.

No. 80.

REBUILDING OF JERICHO.

When Joshua took Jericho, the capital city of the Amorites, it was burned by divine command. And Joshua uttered a prophetic curse upon the man that should rebuild it. "Cursed be the man before the Lord that riseth up and rebuildeth this city Jericho. He shall lay the foundation thereof in (on) his firstborn, and in (on) his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it." Josh. 6:26.

This was fulfilled in the days of Ahab. Hiel of Bethel rebuilt the city. "He laid the foundation thereof in (on) Abiram, his first born, and set up the gates thereof in (on) his youngest son Segub, according to the word of the Lord, which he spake by Joshua, the son of Nun." 1 Kings 16:34.

This man Hiel must have been a great man in the kingdom of Israel, and he must have had a large following to build a city and its walls and gates. Jericho is just east of Bethel and must have been peopled by Bethelites and people of that immediate section under his leadership.

Was he cursed for rebuilding the city, as is usually held? Hardly, for his followers were not cursed. Why are his sons mentioned? Some think his sons died, one at the beginning and one at the completion of the work. Others think that the birth of his sons merely marked

time. Perhaps we may find a far more dreadful reason of the curse in the two passages cited—a reason that was in fearful accord with the apostate times in which he lived, the days of Ahab.

There is a form of human sacrifice which has prevailed in different parts of the world and in parts of Africa to-day, and in parts of Oceanica until recent times. Many years ago a missionary to the Figi Islands which were then cannibal and offered many human sacrifices, published an account of their cruel orgies, of which he had been an eye witness.

The king of one of the islands built him a palace and he buried many victims alive, prisoners of war, in the foundations and when he set up the posts of the gates, the living victims were placed erect beside the posts and the earth filled in till they were covered. These sacrifices were supposed to propitiate their god and to bring good luck to the dwellers in the palace.

By changing the "in" to "on" in both accounts—the prophecy and its fulfillment—we see what Hiel did and the reason of the curse. He laid his foundation on his eldest son, and set up the gates on his youngest son—his own sons human sacrifices.

But we may ask, were human sacrifices tolerated in Israel? Sometimes in apostasy. The worshippers of Moloch placed their human victims in the burning arms of his image, sometimes their own children. King Ahaz and Manasseh seem to have been guilty of this abomination of the heathen.

No. 81.

JOSIAH AND THE BOOK OF THE LAW.

Christ referred to the Old Testament Scriptures as "the Law and the Prophets;" "Moses and the Prophets;" and "the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms." Matt. 22:40; Luke 16:29-31; 24:27. The Law embraced the five books of Moses. It is frequently referred to or quoted as what Moses "said," "spake," "gave," "delivered," "commanded," "wrote," and such like, with divine authority. Christ and the writers of the New Testament believed and taught the genuineness, authenticity, and authority of the "book of Moses."

Does the Old Testament justify this belief? Or was it the product of accretions added to a small and doubtful nucleus by priestcraft and pious frauds, in the name of Moses, as the centuries passed? Was Josiah the victim of a pious fraud, and did his experience mark a half-way house towards a completed code after the exile? Was Moses merely a name to charm with, and not the real author of the whole?

It is not our purpose to discuss these questions exhaustively, but only to note references to this "law of Moses" in the Old Testament, which do justify the references to it in the New Testament as quoted above.

In the thirty-first chapter of Deuteronomy we learn that Moses wrote the law which he had just recapitulated and reaffirmed and he finished the writing—a holographic copy. Verses 9 and 24. He delivered it to the Levites who bare the ark of the covenant and to all the elders of Israel to keep. He said to these Levites, "Take this Book of the Law and lay it up beside the ark of the covenant for a witness." The reference to the

bearing of the ark locates this transaction on the east of the river where Moses locates it.

Moses also enjoined that a copy should be read to all the people every seventh year at the feast of Tabernacles. Verses 10-13. At the same time he repeated and re-emphasized the curses which he had previously uttered with prophetic vision. Verses 16-18 and 27-30; 32; 15-43. Moses threw the curses into poetic numbers to be recited and sung lest they be forgotten.

In the provision for a king, as found in Deut. 17:15-20, it was enjoined that every king should write out a "copy of this law" for him to keep by him to read and observe all his days. He was to copy from the original holograph, which was kept by the priests and Levites as above set forth. It was the official copy.

Ample provision was made to teach and perpetuate the statutes, commandments and judgments, both in the family and in the public at large. Deut. 6:6-25.

When the Lord gave his charge to Joshua he makes "This Book of the Law" supreme. Josh. 1:8. A little later Joshua built an altar as commanded by Moses, "as it is written in the Book of the Law of Moses." Josh. 8:31. In 2 Kings 14:6 the "Book of the Law of Moses" is quoted again. These are all the references to this "Book" as such, prior to the time of Josiah. But the references are very numerous to "Thy Law," "God's Law," "The Law of the Lord," "All the Law," "The Law," "My Law," "This Law," "The Law of Moses," and such like.

Besides this varied nomenclature the history is a continuous record of usages and practices, enjoined or forbidden by this Law. There is hardly a paragraph of the record that does not presuppose this "Law" in its entirety. All this is re-enforced all the way through the

prophetical and poetical books of the Old Testament to be reduplicated again throughout the New.

We are now in position to locate and account for the "Book of the Law" found in the temple and read to King Josiah, and read by him to all the people; at which time he and all the people renewed the covenant of their fathers according to the "Book of the Covenant found in the house of the Lord."

If this was the official copy already referred to, it is no wonder he wept over the curses impending over his people, for "His heart was tender," and Huldah, the prophetess, confirmed afresh all the curses in the book.

When Manasseh profaned the house of the Lord with idols and altars for Baal and all the hosts of heaven, setting them up in the house itself, and in the two courts, faithful and holy Levites removed the "Holy Ark" for safe keeping. We may fairly infer that they also hid away with it the altar of incense, the candlestick, table of shewbread and its vessels, the official book of the law and other valuable things to prevent desecration and spoliation.

Such was the condition of the temple when Josiah became king at eight years old. The orthodox party came into power at the death of Amon, Shaphan and Hilkiah being regents and counsellors. In the twelfth year of his reign he started a reformation throughout his kingdom, along all lines according to Moses' law, which shows that he was trained in these things from his youth. He spent six years so and purged the land and the house of the Lord.

In the eighteenth year of his reign he instituted extensive repairs of the temple and the various compartments in the temple area, on the completion of which the

ark was restored to its place and other sacred furniture and utensils also.

While these things were in progress Hilkiah found the official copy of the "Book of the Law," and gave it to Shaphan, the scribe, to deliver to the king. It also appears that Jeremiah the son of Hilkiah the High Priest was Josiah's prophet and adviser after the twelfth year of his reign.

All the facts in this history of the "Book of the Law" not only cohere with each other, but they cohere with all the history of Israel whether viewed backwards or forwards.

If Josiah's book was a pious fraud perpetrated by Hilkiah, Shaphan, Huldah and Jeremiah the redactors have accomplished a marvelous literary feat in so altering all previous history and all subsequent references to it, as to validate the fraud for all ages.

This is a case in which common sense is worth more than high critical scholarship.

No. 82.

RENEWALS OF THE COVENANT.

The Theocratic Covenant was made at Mt. Sinai between the Lord Jehovah, the second person of the Trinity, and his people Israel. It was a civil compact, proposed by the Lord through Moses and accepted by unanimous vote of the elders who represented the people. They became by this covenant a "peculiar treasure to the Lord above all people," and a "kingdom of priests and a holy nation." The government thus formally instituted is called a Theocracy.

The Lord, by unanimous vote, was made their civil head and king. They pledged their alligeance to obey

his voice and keep his covenant. Ex. 19:5-8. "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." This covenant is the key to Sinaitic legislation and to all the subsequent history of his people. All their prosperity and blessings came from keeping this covenant and all their disasters came from its infractions. It is a curious fact that none of their five murmurings before reaching Sinai were punished. The next five were severely punished because they had covenanted to obey.

There was an ecclesiastical side to this covenant which we need not discuss here except to say that the civil and the religious were so intimately connected that they stood or fell together.

It has often happened that nations, peoples and individuals drift away from their constitutions, fundamental principles, most sacred covenants, and vows of allegiance; and it becomes necessary to recognize their obligations anew under the most solemn sanctions. This has been done ofttimes in some great crisis.

Then again vows are often renewed in order to the keeping of them more faithfully. The Roman emperor about to fight a great battle, sometimes administered the oath of allegiance with great pomp and pageant in order to arouse his legions to a patriotic frenzy. We find in the history several renewals of the Theocratic covenant.

1. Forty years after the covenant at Mt. Sinai, and just before his death, Moses called all Israel and renewed the covenant in the plains of Moab, under the most solemn sanctions. He reminded them of their many rebellions. He adjured them to renew and keep the covenant, standing before the Lord; and they ratified it with oaths duly administered. Deut. Chapters 29 and 30.

2. Joshua, the very day he died, gathered all Israel before the Lord in Shechem, their elders, heads, judges and officers. After a brief review of their history he propounded the covenant anew and they ratified it again with earnest and persistent vote. Joshua wrote it in a book, and set up a great stone for a witness. Joshua, chapter 24.

3. In Asa's great reformation Judah renewed the covenant, and "they sware unto the Lord with a loud voice and with shoutings, and with trumpets and with cornets." Those who refused were ordered to be put to death. 2 Chron. 15:9-15.

4. After the fearful apostasies of Ahaz and Manasseh Josiah read from the "book of the covenant," found in the temple by Hilkiah, to a great conclave, the priests and the prophets, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. "And he renewed the covenant, and all the people stood to the covenant." 2 Kings 23:3.

5. When Ezra and Nehemiah were settling all things in order after the captivity they proclaimed a great fast and they repented, making mention of the sins of themselves and their fathers, and reading the "Book of the Law of Moses." And they made a sure covenant and the princes, Levites and priests set their seal to it—24 priests, 18 chief Levites, and 44 chiefs of the people. And all the rest of the priests and Levites and nobles gave in their adhesion, and "entered into a curse and oath to walk in God's law." Neh. 9:1-38 to 10:1-29.

These reformations and renewals and perhaps many more that are not recorded were great national movements to restore their broken vows and to propitiate their chastening ruler and king.

While all this was civic, national and theocratic, we may be sure that it was accompanied by a revival of

religion, more or less genuine and extensive. No doubt very many repented of their personal sins while bewailing their unfaithfulness as a people, to say nothing of the quickening of all the graces in those who had not gone astray.

No. 83.

NOAH, DANIEL, AND JOB.

Ezek. 14:12-21.

MOSES AND SAMUEL.

Jer. 15:1-3.

In rebuking the hopeless and aggravated wickedness of the people the Lord said four times to Ezekiel that the intercession of Noah, Daniel and Job would not deliver them from famine, noisome beasts, the sword nor pestilence, the punishments for their sins. "Though Noah, Daniel and Job were in it (in the land) as I live, saith the Lord, they shall deliver neither son nor daughter."

The Lord said to Jeremiah, "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people."

We have here five great men of the ages most likely to prevail in intercession for the sinning people, to deliver them from war, famine, pestilence and captivity—five men, Noah, Job, Moses, Samuel and Daniel.

According to the history these five were most highly favored of heaven, great epoch making men of the ages. They were admitted to the most intimate confidential relations with the Lord. They were all great representative men and all the history crystalized around them, and their heads towered above all their generations.

1. Noah was the connecting link between two worlds —a preacher of righteousness for centuries before and after the Flood.

2. Job represented the righteous of all ages in the gigantic struggle for vindication against the slanders and the malignity of Satan.

3. Moses set up the Sinaitic covenant, having received it all in face to face converse with God, forty days at a time. And he administered it for forty years after.

4. Samuel was the transition between the judges and the kingdom. While he did not originate the prophetic order he so developed it as to make it the great balance wheel of the kingdom.

5. Daniel moulded and fashioned the great Babylonian and Medo-Persian empires. He crushed out the last remains of apostasy from his people. He nurtured and befriended the orthodox through five dynasties, secured the return from captivity and established the status of the Jews of the dispersion after him. And his prophetic ken still sweeps the whole arc of time.

These were the five great men of the ages, and were so recognized by God himself. They had power with God. Who were more likely than they to prevail with God? Their possibilities were equalled by their opportunities.

Need we argue that these men were real men, each and every one—if one then all— each the hero of his epoch. Ezekiel believed in them, so did Jeremiah,and so did God himself. History stands or falls with them.

Yet there are critics who consider Noah half mythical. They find Job the hero of a great poem. And they find Daniel an overrated historian who can't even tell us who was Darius the Mede.

God's mention of these five men gives us a sweeping

glance at the historical unity of all Scripture which needs no verification and admits of no doubt.

No. 84.

THE BOOK OF ESTHER.

The place of Esther in the canon of Scripture has never been challenged by Jews nor by Christians until recent times. It was included in an unchallenged canon in Christ's day. Ezra or Nehemiah must have passed on its genuineness and authenticity when they edited the canon in its present form. One or the other may have been its author, or more likely Mordecai. The book seems to burn with intense experiences of thrilling adventure, tempered with an abiding faith. His allegiance to his king, his devotion to his people, his hatred of the Amalekite, the consummate wisdom of himself and niece, and their joyous triumph over their enemies, are all told in so thrilling a way that we are constrained to believe the story was written by an active participant.

We do not propose to repeat the story, nor solve all the questions that are started, but only to notice a few items of interest both old and new.

1. The story is located in the reign of that Ahasuerus who reigned over 127 provinces from India to Ethiopia. Esth. 1:1.

2. Two other kings of that name are mentioned in sacred history. One was Astyages the son of Cyaxares, who was Darius, the Mede. Dan. 9:1; 11:1. The other was Cambysis, the son of Cyrus. Ezra 4:6. I follow Prideaux. But scholars are not agreed.

3. It is more than likely that the name Ahasuerus was a Hebrew title used as a proper name, like Abimelek and Pharoah in early history, Darius and Artaxerxes

were doubtless titles also, and were readily so recognized in their day, but not easily distinguished in some cases to-day.

4. Josephus identifies the Ahasuerus of Esther with Artaxerxes Longimanus, the son and successor of Xerxes.

5. This was the Artaxerxes who issued a commission and a decree to Ezra in his seventh year—a decree of the largest liberality and couched in pious phrase to honor the "God of Heaven" and to uphold and enforce his law. Ezra 7:11-26.

6. He also, in his twentieth year, issued his famous commission and decree to Nehemiah, from which date we count the seventy weeks of Daniel. Neh. 2:1-8.

7. Nehemiah was the king's cup-bearer and he pleaded for this boon with a sad face and we are told that the sympathetic queen was sitting by the side of the king. Neh. 2:1-6. Why is the queen mentioned here? And what queen was so likely to intercede for his people as the beautiful and pious Esther?

8. His four great predecessors, great military heroes, extended and consolidated their empire till they were dashed in pieces on the shores of Greece and Xerxes was slain, and the empire was falling to pieces like a rope of sand.

9. Then Artaxerxes Longimanus took charge of the empire and by a wise diplomacy, judicious alliances, treaties of peace and a few generous campaigns brought order out of chaos in a very short time, and developed and consolidated the empire by the arts of peace, during a reign of thirty-nine years.

10. A careful study of the book of Esther gives many hints and pointers which reveal the generous spirit and policy of Ahasuerus and his kingdom, which finds no parallel except in the case of Longimanus. Modern

scholarship tends to claim that Xerxes was the husband of Esther and that her name was Hamestris, a woman infamous for her wanton cruelties. It would seem to be a misfit all around.

11. The long reign of this Ahasuerus served to accentuate the Asiatic policy towards the Jews of the dispersion and guarantee their permanent popularity and prosperity.

12. The feast of Purim established by Mordecai and Esther has been a permanent memorial of this story and witness of its truth.

13. The lesson of the story. May we not quote the covenant? "Him that blesseth thee I will bless, and him that curseth thee I will curse."

No. 85.

THE LOT.

"The lot is a contrivance to determine a question by chance or without action of man's choice or will." What is chance? It is the absence of any defined or recognized determinative cause within the limits of natural law and second causes. Casting lots, or drawing lots has been practiced in all ages and among all peoples. Its origin was divine and its use authoritative, and like all other divine institutions we find it safeguarded in the Scriptures.

We find in the Scriptures two kinds or classes of lots sharply distinguished from each other—the ordinary and the extraordinary lot.

1. We may consider the extraordinary lot first. It was a mode of divine communication of equal authority with inspiration, prophetic vision or divine oracle. Its determinations were as clearly supernatural as the

miracles and were so accepted. We may cite a few cases.

Achan, the marplot at Ai, was discovered by casting lots. His confession confirmed the divine testimony. There was no need of further witness. He perished by the lot.

The twelve tribes of Israel were located by lot in their God-given inheritances. These had been outlined, in part at least, with prophetic ken by Jacob ere he died. "Joshua cast lots for them in Shiloh, before the Lord." Josh. 18:10. This indicates further that the lot was an act of worship.

Jonathan's unfortunate mistake was revealed by lot after Saul had asked the Lord to give a perfect lot. 1 Sam. 24:41, 42—an act of worship again.

We find the same feature in Acts 1:24-26, when the eleven apostles prayed and then cast lots and Matthias was numbered with the eleven.

The case of Jonah has many interesting details which we cannot discuss here. Suffice it to say that it was a divine revelation avouched by Jonah, himself a prophet.

In its final analysis this extraordinary lot is the same in its essence as all other modes of divine revelation, inspiration, prophecy, vision and oracle. They all belong to a dispensation that has passed away. The attempt to perpetuate any one of these modes of divine revelation to-day is an unwarranted superstition.

2. The ordinary lot. This may be called the governmental lot. It is used to secure absolute impartiality in administration. It removes the decision from human choice and will.

We find a warrant for its use in Prov. 18:18. "The lot causeth contentions to cease, and parteth between the mighty." The "mighty" are parties to civil processes. This lot has been used in all ages and in all

governments to this day in the division of inheritances, in determining the order of business, the choice of agencies, and such like, where possible partiality would cause dissatisfaction and perhaps give occasion to injustice and fraud.

This governmental lot was in constant use in both the civil and ecclesiastical administration of temple service. Priests, Levites, judges, porters, singers, players on instruments, etc., were divided into courses and their special times, seasons, and duties were distributed by lot. This secured orderly distribution of service, and wholesome alternations. This lot must not be confounded with the lot for divine revelation.

This lot is an act of worship. Solomon says "The lot is cast into the lap and the whole disposal thereof is of the Lord." It is a direct appeal to a higher tribunal than man, and the decision is so accepted.

It is the counterpart of the governmental oath which is for confirmation and is the end of strife. Heb. 6:16. It is also an act of worship. The oath invokes God to testify along with the witness. The lot invokes him to take part in the administration. God is the author of government and he stands behind it with the oath and the lot—the oath to secure truth and the lot to secure impartiality. These both are appeals to God and are sacred to their several uses and purposes. They are both divine institutions and may not be perverted to other purposes for which we have no warrant.

If the oath be profaned it begets a recklessness of integrity and truth and unsettles the foundations of righteous government. If the lot be profaned it begets a recklessness of human rights and righteous administration. Chicanery and covetousness usurp the seat of just judgment.

The unwarranted and profane lot sits enthroned in the plays and games and amusements of childhood and youth, in the games of chance of maturer years, in licensed lotteries, in the gambler's den, in the marts of trade until this, the present generation, seems to be a generation of gamblers.

In looking for the virus of gambling we find its fountain head in the profane use of the lot. Every tossed penny, every throw of the dice, every cut of the cards and every turn of the wheel has a stake depending on it. The stake or forfeit may be great or small, but it is real—it may be only a move in the game or it may be a patrimony of 10,000 sesterces.

No. 86.

CANTICLES.

The Song of Solomon.

The Hebrew title of this book attributes its authorship to King Solomon. Its place in the authenticated Old Testament canon was never questioned by the Jews and is of equal authority with the other books on the list; nor was its authorship questioned. Modern speculations to the contrary can have no standing unless they be proven. Assumptions do not set aside presumptions which have had the right of way for 3,000 years.

It is confessedly a love story of espousals and marriage abounding in extravagant figures and poetic license. Mutual admiration, devotion and affection inspire the whole with unwavering faith in anticipated joys and happiness, which are realized at the end. In structure it is recognized as monologue and dialogue.

The two principal characters are the Bride and the

Bridegroom. The Bridegroom is Solomon, "the Prince of Peace," and the Bride is Sulamith, "The Beautiful," or "The Happy." While Solomon's name is mentioned several times, there is no certainty that he and any one of his wives are the heroes of the story.

Is it a story of real life in poetic numbers? This is the latest theory. But it greatly discredits Solomon as trying to seduce with the glamor of his wealth and luxury, a beautiful country maiden, loyal, heart and soul, to her shepherd spouse. The lecherous king is baffled by the love and devotion that many waters cannot quench, nor floods drown—which all the substance of a man's house cannot buy.

This theory finds it written in the interest of home and virtue and conjugal fidelity, as against the seducer and the adulterer. It recognizes no spiritual significance aside from this. If this were all, it were a laudible aim, worthy of a poet laureate.

It is not likely that Solomon would so portray himself in a song to be sung by the daughters of Zion. It becomes necessary to find some other author. At the risk of being considered a reactionary I would recur to the traditionary theory that had the right of way for 3,000 years. Is it not an allegory?

This was the view of the Jewish Talmuds from the earliest mention of the book. They spiritualized the song—Jehovah, the Lover and the Bridegroom, and his people, the Bride. Their relations are set forth and elaborated in figures drawn from the highest earthly loves. They drew the parallel with great minuteness of detail. Christian interpreters have made Christ the Lover and Bridegroom and the Church the Bride. We need not pause to show that the Jewish and Christian theories are one and the same.

What is an allegory? One story is told and another story is meant. The first story may or may not be true to nature. Its incidents may or may not be possible. They may be partly true or partly false and even bizarre. The discussions may be partly literal or partly figurative or even fantastic.

On the other hand the real story told in allegory must be absolutely true in its persons, facts and doctrines illustrated thereby. The literal and the figurative may be used interchangeably in both stories. This is notably true in long allegories.

Allegories, parables, fables, types and miracles have more or less of drapery which may not be spiritualized nor used to teach any truth. This makes their interpretation more difficult. In fact, no part of any of them may be used to set up or prove any truth but only to illustrate and accentuate truth already recognized. This is a fundamental principle of interpretation. All manner of false doctrine, vagaries, and conceits are born of its violation. Mistakes just here have brought allegorizing into great disrepute, and rightly so.

Canticles has very much of mere ornament, costume and drapery, which can have no spiritual significance. It is the picturesque setting of still more picturesque truths. The mystery of the book and its manifold interpretations are the fault of the interpretators and their false exegesis.

The basic figure in this allegory frequently occurs in the Scriptures—Jehovah, Christ, the Bridegroom; his people, the Church, the Bride. We find a startling panoramic view in the song of songs.

The question recurs, How may we safeguard all figures of speech? Their sole use and function is illustration. We must recognize the essential element of the

figure, must discover the truth to be illustrated, and observe the proportion of faith with a modicum of common sense, and we shall not go far astray.

No. 87.

THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

The authorship of the book is ascribed to Solomon and it has never been seriously questioned. He was a philosopher and was the author of three thousand proverbs. Only selections have been preserved in this book.

Proverbs are short, pithy sentences expressing the results of observation and experience, practical maxims to regulate conduct. Sometimes they are paradoxical in form with apparent contradictions so as to awaken interest; sometimes enigmas, or "dark sayings," requiring careful attention for their solution. Their structure and forms of expression, usually poetic, made them stick like burrs in the memory.

The book consists of three sections and an appendix.

I. The first section consists of the first nine chapters. It is thrown into the form of a father's counsel to his son, or a teacher to his pupil. It is a brief but comprehensive system of morals.

It consists of thirty-three paragraphs and as many topics, which sometimes overlap each other. Instead of condensation into single aphorisms, the topics are expanded, amplified, and discussed more or less fully to regulate the conduct and the life, all in aphoristic form and poetic numbers. The germinal thought in each paragraph may be easily seen, if indeed it be not fully expressed in proverbial form.

II. The second section, headed, "The Proverbs of Solomon," includes the next fifteen chapters, 10–24.

These are proverbs proper, with no amplification or topical discussion, except that the most of them are duplicated or repeated in parallel or synonymous forms according to the genius of Hebrew poetry. These duplications are mutually explanatory. They safeguard the truth from perversion and misapplication, which is the danger in the use of proverbs.

The brief proverbs of this section are very numerous and are maxims for the conduct of all classes and conditions of men, in all the varied occupations of life. There are suggestions and rules and subjects for masters and servants, for buyer and seller—personal maxims and business maxims—prudential rules for every calling.

While mainly politic and prudential, many of them have a necessary ethical and moral side. We may be permitted to characterize the whole as the philosophy of common sense, regulating human conduct on one side with morality, and on the other with prudence.

III. The third section consists of five chapters, 25–29. The heading is, "These are also proverbs of Solomon which the men of Hezekiah, king of Judah, copied out." This evidently means that they were edited and authenticated under the auspices of King Hezekiah. The general type of these proverbs is the same as in Section II.

IV. The Appendix, chapters 30 and 31. Both chapters are inspired—endorsed as "prophecy."

1. The words of Agur, either endorsed and adopted by Solomon or added by a competent editor of the book. Chap. 30. The conception and style are unique and different from Solomon's. Nearly all the lessons are grouped into quartets, some antithetic, some climactic, and some co-ordinate—perhaps a dozen groups in all. We might add that enigmatic features pervade them all.

2. Chapter 31. "The words of King Lemuel, the

prophecy that his mother taught him." She warned him against women, strong drink, and perverting of judgment—the three temptations of kings. 30:2–9.

Then she sketched for him in alphabetical acrostic poesy, the "virtuous woman," the ideal woman—the ideal wife—in whom is found all the possibilities and potentialities of life, manifested at home and abroad, the inspiration, the crown and the glory of her husband.

No. 88.

THE SIGN OF THE PROPHET JONAH.

It is not our purpose to discuss the prophet nor to vindicate the story. The book of Jonah is in the canon of Scripture as recognized by Christ and by the Jews of Christ's day. To us this is sufficient vindication of the story that Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the great fish that God prepared for him.

We simply propose to discuss the significance of this story outside of and beyond the immediate commission and experience of the prophet.

The Jews demanded of Jesus a sign, a miraculous attestation of his claims. They had rejected his mighty works as insufficient. They called for one that could not be gainsaid or refused. He promptly gave them the sign of the prophet Jonas. "For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Matt. 12:39–41. He gave them the same sign on another occasion. Matt. 16:1–4. Perhaps he did so on other occasions also. Luke 11: 29, 30.

Christ cites it as the climactic sign—the most unexpected and improbable of all the miracles—the supreme sign, sign of what? It was also the supreme and cli-

mactic type of all the types in the Old Testament Scriptures. Type of what? It was the supreme and climactic type of Christ's death, burial and resurrection.

It was a sufficient sign and type of the Gospel Jonah preached in Ninevah. "They repented at the preaching of Jonas" and they "shall rise in judgment with this generation and condemn it." "Behold a greater than Jonas is here"—the great anti-type. It was the great climactic and final sign and type of Christ or it was nothing but a fable, an idle story. The Jews dared not reject it.

The story of Jonah stands like a great embattled fortress in defense of our Lord, dead, buried and risen again. The skirmish lines of the enemy to-day are formed around its walls. The sappers and the miners seek to destroy its foundations. The thunder of the heaviest scholastic artillery would batter down its turrets.

To change the figure, sneers and ridicule and witticisms do claim the day in the assaults upon Jonah. Full well do the enemies know that if there be no Jonah, there is no Christ of the Gospel. They stand or fall together, for Christ has so declared it.

No. 89.

ENOCH AND ELIJAH. IMMORTALITY.

It is surprising that so little is said in the earlier Scriptures about certain doctrines that are seen to be fundamental and almost self-evident in the New Testament. The doctrine of the Trinity, the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the change in the twinkling of an eye and other things are so little emphasized in the Old Testament, that many imagine them to be New Testament doctrines only.

We may account for it in several ways, to wit:

1. Surface doctrines are easily overlooked.

2. Certain assumptions lie at the foundation of all the institutions and all the history of the race whether emphasized or not.

3. Truths universally accepted called for no special mention and for no categorical definitions.

4. Such truths come into prominence when they have to be defended against heretical attack.

5. But it does happen that such truths often appear in concrete form in a most unexpected way. In fact, this seems to be a favorite Scripture method of presenting obvious truths.

Was man immortal after the sentence of death passed upon him? And if so, did the antediluvians have any positive evidence of it?

We answer, yes. Enoch, the seventh son of Adam, lived three hundred and sixty-five years, and "Enoch walked with God; and he was not; for God took him." Or, as Paul says, "By faith, Enoch was translated that he should not see death and was not found because God had translated him." What more did the men of his day need to confirm the doctrine of immortality—body and soul?

Elijah's translation in a chariot of fire confirms the faith in the ages after the Flood, till Christ should make manifest life and immortality by his own resurrection glory. We need not dwell upon it. All the arguments for man's immortality and all the facts of a future life do cluster about Enoch and Elijah and Christ.

Moses seems to have been admitted into the trio by way of resurrection from the grave. Jude seems to teach that Michael, the archangel, who is to be the agent of the resurrection, invaded Satan's realm of death,

and bare the body of Moses to his resurrection glory. Jude 9. If so, Moses and Elias stood on the Mount of Transfiguration in their resurrection bodies and Christ was changed or transfigured in anticipation of his glorious departure from Jerusalem on the Mount of Olives.

No. 90.

INFALLIBILITY. INSPIRATION. INERRANCY.

These three terms are frequently confounded with each other, and the use of the cognate words infallible, inspired and inerrant, frequently adds to the confusion. We wish to give simple definitions of these terms and ascertain their proper usage and limitations.

1. Inspiration. We have the simplest definition in 2 Peter 1:21. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." This moving is a divine act. In Job 32:8, we read, "The inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." In 2 Tim. 3:16, we read, "All Scripture given by inspiration of God." It is a divine act moving upon the intelligence and communicating prophecy. 2 Pet. 1:21. "For prophecy came not in old time by the will of man."

2. Inspired. The man moved by the Holy Ghost was inspired and spake accordingly. His message, spoken or written, was an inspired message because it was God-given. The prophet was inspired only to the extent of the divine act and according to the divine pleasure, which determined the times, seasons, mode and measure of this divine activity.

3. Infallibility. This may not be predicated of any man. *Humanum est errare.* No prophet could claim it except within the limits of his inspiration and except he could say, "Thus saith the Lord."

4. Infallible. God alone is infallible, free from all liability to make a mistake in word or deed, speaking through the Holy Ghost. The product of inspiration, the prophet's message is infallible because it is of divine origin. Then we say that the Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

5. Inerrancy and inerrant. These two terms are of recent origin and use in theological controversies. They are used to vindicate the original autographs of the Scriptures from errors, great or small.

We find errors in copying, in transmission, in translation—such errors as the most faithful and painstaking care cannot escape. After a century of exhaustive collation and comparison of manuscripts, quotations and translations, we are assured that we have substantially the inerrant autographs of the original Scriptures. No material fact and no doctrine is put in jeopardy by the numerous variations.

6. Papal infallibility. We may not overlook this stupendous heresy which was promulgated by a decree of the Vatican Council, July 18, 1870, after months of discussion. This infallibility resides in the Pope of Rome in his official capacity, an apostolic function, a final authority, when he speaks, *ex cathedra*, touching any doctrine of faith and morals, and binding on the universal church as if promulgated by Christ and the Holy Ghost. Such infallibility is not claimed anywhere in the Scriptures, nor claimed by any prophet save by God himself.

We read of this usurpation in 2 Thess. 2:3, 4. "The man of sin;" "the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

No. 91.

THE LIMITS OF INSPIRATION.

The prophet of the Scriptures was a spokesman, one who spoke for God. He delivered a message, a "Thus saith the Lord," duly attested as far as necessary. He received his message in one of several ways. But in every case, it was a divine communication given only on occasion from a person (God) speaking to a person (the prophet).

If this be true, inspiration was not a subjective condition. There was no modification of the intellectual processes nor moral status of the prophet. Moses was God's prophet and Aaron was Moses' prophet in exactly the same sense.

Prophecy was not a permanent function. The prophet was so-called because he spoke for God whenever he was commanded to do so. It may have been but once, or it may have been many times, according to God's good pleasure.

We read of no case where the prophet did not deliver his message truthfully and accurately under the impulse of his divine commission and communication, though he may have sometimes sought to evade his duty, as in the case of Jonah.

We may assume that ordinarily God used good men for the exercise of the prophetic function. But outside of their commission they were liable to the same mistakes, infirmities and sins as other good men. It is also plain that God sometimes commissioned and used bad men for prophecy. This indicates that there is no necessary connection between moral character and the spirit of prophecy.

We are now in a position to understand and explain

certain facts in the history which have given trouble.

Take the case of the old prophet at Bethel who lied to the prophet who had rebuked Jeroboam and rent his altar and palsied his arm. He believed the lie of the old prophet and disobeyed God's command and was slain by a lion on the wayside. Here we find human frailty, sin and unbelief, and yet they both were doubtless good men. 1 Kings 13:1–32. We may not explain all this until we can explain why good men are allowed to sin at all.

Take the case of Balaam the High Priest and Prophet of Midian. He spake true in the face of strong temptation. Officially he was true as steel, but personally as corrupt as sin—the typical bad man of the Bible. Numb. chapters 22, 23, 24 and 31. Compare Jude 11; Rev. 2:14.

Take the case of Caiaphas and his famous prophecy. He delivered his prophecy faithfully, but he used it to further and to justify their bloodthirsty persecution of Christ. John 11:49-52; 18:14.

No. 92.

WHO WERE THE SAMARITANS?

Omri founded the city of Samaria and made it the capital of the kingdom of Israel and it so continued till the captivity. The country around the city was called Samaria in later times and embraced the inheritance of the tribes of Manasseh and Ephraim.

When Esarhaddon deported the last remnant of Israel a few of these two tribes seem to have been left and he transplanted settlers from Assyria, mainly from the provinces of Cuthah and Arpad. These were idolaters. He had them taught to worship Jehovah. These ele-

ments gradually coalesced and finally claimed to be of Israel.

Ezra and Nehemiah banished all the Jews who refused to put away their Gentile wives. They cast in their lot with these Samaritans, weaned them from their idolatry and built a rival temple on Mount Gerizim, where they observed the Jewish ritual. They affected a more intense adherence to Moses than the Jews themselves. The bitterest rancor and petty warfare were developed on both sides. Their mutual hatred was handed down for centuries till Christ's day, and the final overthrow of the Jewish polity. Their temple was destroyed by John Hyrcanus and was not rebuilt.

They rejected all the Old Testament Scriptures except the five books of Moses. They claimed that all the other books as edited by Ezra and Nehemiah were written in the interest of their Jewish rivals. They also rejected the Pharisaic constitutions or traditions and they were equally opposed to the philosophical vagaries of the Sadducees. They seem also to have had a more spiritual view of the promised Messiah.

They seem to have had a better type of Judaism than the Jews themselves. Their intense jealousy and rivalry prevented them from adopting the declension in faith and practice which prevailed in Christ's day among the Jews.

The two streams parted at the captivity and from that time the Samaritans have guarded the Penteteuch, still written in the old Hebrew script, except that they seem to have altered some passages and interpolated others in order to justify their permanent separation from the Jews.

A small remnant of the sect still remains at Nabalus and they are extremely poor, about 200 in number.

They still offer the morning and evening sacrifice on an altar on Mt. Gerizim, when not intimidated by Turkish rule. They guard their sacred books with the most jealous care.

No. 93.

THE LOST TEN TRIBES.

Were they lost? There were four captivities or deportations of the population of the kingdom of Israel—deportations by Pul, by Tiglath-Pileser, by Shalmaneser (claimed by Sargon) and by Esarhaddon. They spanned sixty-five years and probably more from the first to the last. They were carried away to Assyria and settled in its various provinces in the Central Asian valleys along the Tigris and the Euphrates, even as low down as Babylon which was dominated by Assyria a part of that time.

A remnant was still left in the land of Israel subject to the king of Judah, supplemented by settlers sent from Assyria. These became the nucleus of the Samaritans with their corrupted worship.

The kingdom or the commonwealth of Israel was never restored, as such. It is popularly believed that these ten tribes were absorbed and lost in the populations of the Assyrian empire which had become the Babylonian empire in the days of Nebuchadnezzar. He deported the kingdom of Judah, two tribes, Judah and Benjamin, and adhering Levites, in three captivities, and settled them in practically the same regions in which the ten tribes had been settled.

It is a mistake to suppose that the kingdom of Judah was restored by Daniel and Cyrus at the close of seventy years. But the Hebrew commonwealth was restored in

Theocratic garb and form. The restored people were called Israel and Jews, interchangeably, by both Ezra and Nehemiah, who were the renewers, the leaders, the prophets and the historians of the commonwealth. They set everything in order according to the law of Moses.

When they make mention of "all Israel" they must have included the twelve tribes, just as Moses and Joshua did when they spake of "all Israel."

At the restoration it is evident that only about one-fiftieth of Israel returned—42,000 and their servants. Of these, 30,000 belonged to Judah and Benjamin and the Levites, according to their genealogies. The other 12,000 were presumably from the other ten tribes. It is easy to see why so few of the ten tribes volunteered to return. They had taken root longer in a foreign land and their traditions were correspondingly weakened. Besides this, they had been long weaned from Jerusalem and the temple by the national policy of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat.

It is now pertinent to ask if there is any note taken of any of the ten tribes about this time and afterwards. In Ezekiel's vision of the city and temple and their measurements great prominence is given to the distinctions and portions of the twelve tribes. Similar prominence is given to all the several tribes in the visions of John in Revelation.

When we read Matt. 4:12-16 and Christ's quotation from Is. 9:1, 2 we feel sure that remnants of Zebulun and Naphtali rejoiced in the light of Christ's visit and teaching. Apropos of this the book of Tobit, of late origin, is a secular story telling the fortunes of a family belonging to the tribe of Naphtali.

Anna, the prophetess, who blessed the babe in the temple belonged to the tribe of Asher. If the ten tribes

were lost Paul knew nothing about it. In his defence before Agrippa he spoke of the promise made to the fathers, and said, "Unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come." Ten tribes lost? Impossible.

The most we can say then is this, the thirteen tribes, with meager exceptions, were in the course of time assimilated gradually into each other in the dispersion as we see them to-day. When tribal distinctions and genealogies had served their purpose they were lost, and God's chosen people are a unit waiting for the "Hope of Israel" and the promise of final restoration.

These very promises of restoration furnish us with the crowning argument that Jacob, Israel, Jews (as opposed to the Gentiles) are still an unbroken people, children of Abraham according to the covenant. "The gifts and callings of God are without repentance."

No. 94.

PROSELYTISM.

A proselyte is one who changes from one party to another under the pressure of some form of solicitation. The term is used almost entirely of converts from one religious sect to another or from one religious faith to another. Converts from paganism to Judaism were called proselytes, also converts to Christianity in heathen lands. This is the supreme function of the Missionary to disciple all nations.

The preaching of the truth, its warnings and its invitations, do constitute a legitimate solicitation. The truth appeals to the highest and best motives for the regulation of human conduct. It is the highest and noblest aim in religion to bring as many as possible under the power

of the truth. Such converts are the true proselytes.

We have noted in a former article that proselytism was the law of the growth of the Jewish people and not purity of blood. We need not illustrate it further here.

After the captivity the Jews of the dispersion became missionaries to the Pagan world. Every synagogue became a mission station, shedding the light of truth into the surrounding darkness. Much attention was given to proselytism.

The Jewish doctors tell us of two kinds of proselytes —proselytes of justice and proselytes of the gate. Both these were converts from pagan religions and philosophies. They both accepted the truth of the Jewish Scriptures and waited for the "Elpis Israel," the Hope of Israel, the promised Messiah. They were both enrolled in the Jewish synagogues and took part in their worship.

The proselytes of justice became Jews by circumcision. They observed the law of Moses just as every Jew did. They became members of the synagogue and took part in its government and administration.

The proselytes of the gate were enrolled in the synagogue and promised to obey the seven precepts of Noah. They took part in the spiritual worship of the synagogue which in form and substance was the same as we see in a synagogue or in a Christian church of to-day. They were very numerous, especially women. We are told by Uhlhorn that at one time every woman in Damascus, of whatever nationality, was a member of a Jewish synagogue.

These were the numerous "devout" (*asebeis*) men and women," mentioned again and again in the New Testament. They were pious after the model of spiritual worship, believing in a Saviour to come, the Hope of Israel. The great crowds from all parts of the world

at Pentecost were classified as "Jews and proselytes." Acts 2:10.

At Antioch in Pisidia "many Jews and religious proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas," and they persuaded them to continue in the grace of God. As soon as they learned that Jesus was the Christ they accepted him and rejoiced in him. The pious Jews and the pious Gentiles were first gathered in when convinced that "Jesus is the Christ." This may in large measure account for the rapid growth of the church in apostolic times. The conflict of Christianity and Paganism came a little later.

There is no need to discuss here a fanatical proselytism as practiced by some false religions and some heretical sects. It relies on carnal weapons and appeals to false motives. Its propagandism makes men no better but rather the worse. The followers of Mahomet have practiced it on a gigantic scale. The Pharisees are also a case in hand. Christ said, "Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him two-fold more the child of hell than yourselves."

No. 95.

THE SEVENTY YEARS OF CAPTIVITY.

There has been much discussion and disputation concerning the proper count. There seem to be discrepances between Daniel, Ezekiel and Jeremiah. We find from the history that there were three captivities of Judah. It is more proper to say that there were three stages in the captivity.

1. In the year 606 B. C. in the third year of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem and took the submission of Jehoiakim. At that time he carried away captive

the princes and higher classes of Judah, among whom were Daniel, and his three friends. He also took a part of the vessels of the house of God and deposited them in the treasure house of his god. This was the first stage in the captivity.

2. Eight years later, 598 B. C. after the revolt of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem and carried away captive the new made king Jehoiachin and the princes, and mighty men, and the craftmen and smiths. He took all the treasures of the temple and the royal treasures and he made Zedekiah king over the poorer sort of the people who were left for tillage. This was the second stage.

3. Ten years later, 588 B. C., after Zedekiah rebelled, Nebuchadnezzar besieged and took Jerusalem and Nebuzaradan his chief captain beat down the walls and destroyed the city and carried the people away captive. A remnant was left for vine-dressers and husbandmen, under Gedaliah as ruler. This was the third stage. Gedaliah was slain after two months and the remnant fled to Egypt where they perished.

Daniel counts the seventy years of captivity from the first stage, 606 B. C. Ezekiel dates the captivity as beginning at the second stage, 598 B. C., at which time he was himself a captive. Jeremiah counts the seventy years from the third stage, 588 B. C. Jer. 25:8-11. From that date the land was most desolate for fifty-two years. Compare 2 Chron. 36:21; Levit. 25:4.

How shall we reconcile the discrepancy in these three several counts? The answer is easy if we can find three stages of the restoration corresponding to the three stages in the captivity.

1. Daniel counted from the first captivity to Cyrus' decree of restoration, 606 B. C., to 536 B. C., seventy

years. Cyrus' decree was the first stage in the restoration (606-536).

2. Ezekiel's count from the second captivity, 598 B. C., ended the seventy years at 528 B. C., which is the date of the decree of Cambyses confirming and enforcing the decree of his father Cyrus against all comers. This marked the second stage in the restoration (598-528).

3. The third stage in the restoration is the decree of Darius Hystaspes, 518 B. C., just seventy years after the third captivity, 588 B. C (588-518).

4. There seems to be still another computation of seventy years. In 584 B. C., Nebuzaradan gathered a small remnant of captives and carried them away. Jer. 52:30. Count seventy years from this date and we reach 514 B. C. This is the date of the dedication of the finished temple (584-514).

These are not mere curious and accidental coincidences. The progressive disasters extended over twenty-one years, from Jehoiakim to Nebuzaradan. The progressive restoration extended over twenty-one years, from Cyrus' decree to the dedication of the temple.

No. 96.

JEWISH SECTS.

Before the captivity the two great political parties found their line of cleavage along religious lines—orthodoxy or apostasy—the worship of Jehovah or the worship of idols.

After the captivity their parties became again politico-religious, but the lines of cleavage were inside of a common Judaism. Their political zeal and their religious zeal re-enforced and intensified each other.

Their rivalries sometimes culminated in civil war, but

the outcome was always a more intense patriotism and a more devoted Judaism. The great aim of each party was to control the government, both civil and ecclesiastical.

There were three of these rival parties, Pharisees, Sadducees and Herodians. There was a fourth sect—the Essenes—which attracted little attention because they repudiated all ambitions. The Samaritans were not recognized as a Jewish sect. It is not our purpose to discuss these four sects in full detail, but only to notice their salient features and their mutual relations.

The name Herodians is a later name for an earlier party as we shall see. The three rival parties held the balance of power against each other for centuries. It is a question whether three political parties are not better than two to safeguard rights and liberties. If there be but two political parties corruption is easy and each party vies with the other in misrule and oppression, both in their permanence and their mutations. It often happens to-day that a half organized and a half recognized third party holds the balance of power and saves good government.

The origin of these several sects is veiled in obscurity. We find them fully organized as rival schools of doctrine and philosophy before they attracted the attention of historians, and they must have been well organized before taking much part in politics.

The growth of various schools of thought is necessarily slow and is not revolutionary. The growth of any school stimulates its rivals. The historian takes but little account of such things until they become ambitious of power and seek to control church and state with a strong hand. Such forces sometimes seem to be launched full-grown, but it is not so.

Centuries count but little in the accumulation of forces, and slight notice is taken of them till they disturb seas and continents. It is so in history. The unnoticed forces that culminated in the French Revolution were of slow growth. It is conceded that these Jewish sects began to take form soon after the captivity and they had come to be tremendous forces in the Maccabean period. Their mutations made history thereafter, down to the end of the Jewish polity.

No. 97.

JEWISH SECTS. THEIR TENETS.

I. Pharisees. The name seems to be derived from the verb Pharash, to separate. They were separatists. They were probably first organized and banded together for the cultivation of holiness. They affected distinctions of dress, food and multiplied ceremonies by which to display their sanctity and piety. In the course of time all this degenerated into spiritual pride and hypocrisy. Fanaticism took the place of intelligent and honest zeal. The masses of the people accepted them at their own valuation of themselves.

They professed to accept the Old Testament canon in its entirety, and they claimed great zeal for Moses and the ceremonial law. But they invented the traditions of the elders, a gigantic system of false doctrine and practice by which they made void the law and stripped it of its moral and righteous features. It became the great organized heresy of the ages.

Christ stripped them of their sheep's clothing and shewed them their naked deformity. He analyzed their system into literalism, formalism, covetousness and censoriousness. They held to many Scripture doctrines

without any saving effect on the heart and the life.

II. Sadducees. Scholars differ about the origin of the name. It has the same root as "zedek" which means righteousness. It is probable that they called themselves "The Righteous." They were exceeding zealous for the enforcement of law and for the punishment of evil-doers.

They accepted the Old Testament Scriptures and denounced the Pharisaic constitutions or traditions. They were materialists, rejecting the doctrines of the resurrection and a future life. They taught that rewards and punishments are all adjusted in this life. Their zeal for good and righteous government gave them more prominence in civil affairs than their numbers would seem to justify, while the Pharisees were more distinctly religious teachers.

Their materialistic philosophy does not seem to have degenerated into the licentious Epicureanism of that age. In fact they seem to have represented a higher type of morality than their rivals the Pharisees. While the one "devoured widow's houses" the other would punish the spoiler to the full extent of the law.

III. The Herodians. Both the Pharisees and Sadducees were intensely patriotic and impatient of all foreign domination. They keenly resented the loss of independence and the government of the Romans, and were ever ready to encourage and even foment sedition and murder in the name of patriotism. Witness the case of Barabbas.

The Herodians advocated loyalty to Roman rule as furnishing good and stable government, and were favored and petted accordingly. This intensified the antagonisms. Pharisees and Sadducees were intense believers in a Messianic king who would overthrow the Roman

empire and lead them to world-wide conquest and universal empire.

The Herodians also advocated a liberalized Judaism which should copy an up-to-date Greek and Roman culture free from the shackles of traditional separateness and exclusiveness. While they did not advocate Paganism and its idolatries their religious faith sat loosely upon them.

This was an old party with a new name. It was very powerful in the Maccabeean period, advocating foreign domination and Greek culture. But they were so peeled and overthrown in those heroic and gigantic struggles that they disappear for a season. They re-appear under Herod's long reign of unrivalled prosperity, and took his name to the no small disgust of the other sects.

IV. The Essenes. This sect is not mentioned in the Scriptures. We learn all we know of them from Josephus, Philo the Jew, Pliny, and the first book of Maccabees. They lived in communities and had all things common. They recognized no personal property rights. They contributed their labor to the common stock and drew their living from the same source.

They mostly rejected marriage and had no women in their communities, which they kept alive by adopting children from the outside. They were exceedingly abstemious in their mode of life and their wants were few and easily provided.

They were intense religionists and practiced the highest morality. Personal purity, truthfulness and devotion were their supreme characteristics. The monastic orders and the asceticism of early Christianity were so like this sect that some have argued that the Essenes were a Christian sect.

V. The Karraites. After the destruction of Jerusalem

the distinction of sects gradually disappeared and also their names. But the tenets of the Pharisees came to be universally received. The oral traditions were accepted as of equal authority with their Scriptures, and even superior to them. The final appeal to determine the meaning of the Scriptures was made to the traditions. Their authority was, and still is, regarded as paramount.

These traditions were reduced to writing about the sixth or seventh centuries of the Christian era, under the name Talmuds. The Mishna, the Jerusalem Talmud, expounded the Scriptures with authority. Then the Gemara, the Babylonish Talmud, expounded the Scriptures and the Mishna and gave the final word of faith and practice.

When these Talmuds were promulgated there sprung up a powerful schism of the most learned Jews in middle and eastern Europe and Syria, who rejected the divine authority of these Talmuds and treated them as mere human helps to be stripped of their puerilities and absurdities.

They claimed supreme authority for the Scriptures only. The other Jews were called Rabbinists, because they followed the popular Rabbinical authority. The schismatics called themselves Karraites because they stood for the written word only. The word Kara in Babylonish means "writing" or "Scripture."

Remnants of this sect, about 4,000, are found in Russia and throughout the East. They are said to be the most learned and upright of all the Jewish people. They read and teach the Scriptures everywhere in the vernacular of the countries in which they live.

No. 98.

ON, BETHSHEMESH, BETH-AVEN, HELIOPOLIS.

On was a town or city of lower Egypt and is mentioned by Moses. The name means the sun and seems to have been the place of the old Sabian worship of the sun. Jeremiah calls it Beth-shemesh, the city of the sun. Ezekiel calls it Beth-Aven which means the same. The later Greek name was Heliopolis, the city of the sun. The nome or district around it went by the same name.

This seems to have been the sacred city of the Egyptians and the centre of their worship. The Hyksos or shepherd kings displaced Sabian worship, as the national religion, with the worship of Jehovah during their domination in Egypt. Abraham found it so in his day, and it was evidently so in Joseph's day when he married Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah, the priest of On. Sabian worship seems to have been restored there when the Hyksos were driven out.

Other changes seem to have taken place later on and the temple of the sun was superseded by the temple of Bubastis, or Iris, the great goddess of the Egyptians. This temple in turn fell into decay. Later on the ruins of this temple were cleared away and the Jews built a temple on its site, of the exact form and fashion of the temple at Jerusalem.

When Alexander founded Alexandria he gave the Jews great prominence in the city and throughout Egypt, and great numbers of Jews were attracted to Egypt. The rulers of Egypt relied mainly upon them to uphold their government, for the Egyptians proper despised their foreign rulers. The Heliopolitan nome became the centre of a large Jewish population, and a great military camp, as well, for defense in the gateway of Egypt.

When Onias IV failed to succeed to the priesthood in Jerusalem he fled to Egypt to Ptolemy Philometer, who made him his chief counsellor and commander of his armies. He built the Heliopolitan temple and developed that nome still further as a centre of Jewish life. He attracted Hellenistic or Greek speaking Jews from all quarters until Egypt rivalled Judea in population, culture and religious life.

The Septuagint translation of the Old Testament into Hellenistic Greek was made under the auspices of the Heliopolitan temple. A few verbal changes were made from the original Hebrew in order to justify the building of a temple in Egypt, as if it were provided for by the prophets. Such pious frauds have been only too common in other ages.

The translation was made by piecemeal—the Law first, for only the law was read in the synagogue service. In the course of time the other books—the Prophets and Psalms—were appointed to be read also and the translation was finished for general use.

Priests and Levites were appointed to administer the Mosaic ritual in this temple. It stood 224 years. It was first closed after the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem, and afterward both the temple and the city were destroyed by order of Vespasian, the Roman emperor. The destruction of both these cities and temples was considered necessary to break up the solidarity of the Jewish people. These two centres of Jewish life and Jewish seditions, backed by the Jews of the dispersion and their universal synagogue commonwealth, threatened the very life of the Roman empire. Their destruction was a political necessity.

No. 99.

THE LOGIC OF EVENTS.

Theology seeks to gather up out of the Scriptures and to formulate what we are to believe concerning God, and what duties God requires of man.

Biblical theology seeks to discover how much of divine truth was known and acted upon at particular times and periods and epochs in the history of the race.

Systematic theology is a science. It professes to gather all truths taught in the Scriptures and to arrange them in their proper logical relations to each other and to God and man, and to all the universe, so far as revealed. Like all other sciences it has its inductions, deductions and necessary inferences, all interwoven into a coherent system.

Biblical theology, in its better sense, discovers all truths as found in the Scriptures and in all the ages—the materials to be used in constructing systematic theology.

But the term Biblical theology has been much abused. A certain line of critics have used it to discover how little of truth was known at particular times and epochs. If any book or writer in the Scriptures fails to make mention of any truth or any set of truths this is construed as proof positive that such truth was not then known. With a shrug they waive aside all necessary implications of sound doctrine.

According to them the book of Esther is a pagan product because the name of God is not found in it. They tell us that the Levitical Code was unknown for centuries during the period of the judges because so little mention is made of it in the book of Judges.

They are wondrously prolific of necessary implications to minimize the truth. And if any name or state-

ment crops out in an inconvenient place, it is pronounced an interpolation by a later hand, or the entire document is assigned a later origin. This Biblical theology plays a conspicuous part in the "development of doctrine," and is still more necessary to its "evolution."

However, Biblical theology is not a science at all, but it is one of the processes of systematic theology. It simply hunts for materials. It hunts for the facts to be used in constructive processes.

While the Scriptures are the infallible source of all truth the student of the Bible is liable to error in his interpretation, and also in his analytic and in his constructive processes. Much depends on the methods by which he reaches those abstract truths which he elaborates and constructs into his theology.

The theologian draws his material from three sources, exegetical, historical, and necessary inference from both. His methods therefore may be said to be threefold, exegesis, study of events and logical processes, inductive and deductive. All three of these methods are valuable, and neither may be neglected. Mistakes have been made as to their relative importance.

The third is of the least value because its conclusions are subjective in their origin, and also because they may so easily be modified by preconceived opinions. Here is the matrix of rationalism.

Exegesis has been mainly relied on to set up doctrine. It seeks to discover the exact meaning of each passage of Scripture according to the laws of language. The proof texts cited to verify church standards and formularies indicate almost a sole reliance on exegesis, to the neglect of the logic of events, or the historic method.

In mathematics, if two methods verify each other the result is true. But if they disagree a careful revision is

necessary. So here, if the two methods of exegesis and the study of events agree they re-enforce each other; otherwise the study needs revision. The question then recurs as to the relative value and proper order of the two methods.

We wish now to show that the historic method is the strongest and least liable to error, and that exegesis is ancillary and confirmatory.

The exegesis of single passages is often very uncertain and can be easily and plausibly disputed, and this from the nature of language itself. A categorical statement may include as many categories as there are prominent words in it, according to the emphasis. Take the old familiar example, "Will you ride to town to-day?" Here are five categories according to the emphatic word. It is true that in written discourse the context often indicates the true category and excludes the false, but not always convincingly.

It is just here that so many contradictory doctrines or so many shades of doctrines are gotten out of the same Scriptures. We need not illustrate.

It is just here also that so many shades of philosophy have been harmonized and verified with and by the Scriptures. False philosophy, false theology and false exegesis mutually help each other—a threefold cord. So also with the true.

Of late years the attempts to reconcile the Scriptures with all the vagaries of "Science falsely so-called" have developed an exegetical flexibility which scandalizes both the Scriptures and the exegesis—a nose of wax to fit every face and suit every taste.

Now what is the antidote against all this? The historic method. This was the Old Testament method, and

is the natural method. The lessons were concrete instead of abstract.

1. In Genesis we learn of creation, the family, sin, the fall, the curse, the remedy, death, the flood—all and a great deal more in concrete form. Paul and Peter and Christ himself only cited those incontrovertible lessons.

2. The stories of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and Joseph, if rightly read, embrace a whole scheme of theology. The analysis is easy.

3. Egypt and Sinai and the wilderness fill up Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers with concrete historic facts of supreme value for doctrinal study.

4. This was Moses' method in Deuteronomy. For thirty days before his death he argued with his people and exhorted them to work out their destiny, drawing his lessons from their history and clinching it all with prophecy. So ought we to trace all Old Testament history.

5. Those histories and this method have this advantage. The Lord who administered it all and gave us the record, also gave us the key to it all and revealed himself in it all.

We therefore claim the right of way for the historic method, the logic of events, in learning sound doctrine. Then exegesis, a faithful handmaid, yields her unchallenged service to theology, the queen of all the sciences. The logic of events and a sound exegesis limit, reinforce and verify each other.

No. 100.

THE SCRIPTURES, CHRISTOCENTRIC.

The word Christocentric is of recent invention. Like many other catchy words and phrases coined to express some plausible doctrine or half truth, it has been popularized and then adopted by staunch orthodoxy.

The inventors of this term affect to honor Christ supremely and make his teaching the final standard of faith and practice, as against the inadequate teaching of the Old Testament and the faulty speculations of his apostles, and the still more faulty creeds of subsequent ages. They piously cry "Back to Christ," "What would Jesus do?" "What would Jesus say?" They fail to ask, "What did Jesus do?" "What did Jesus say?"

They determine *a priori* what Jesus would do and say and make that the final standard of faith and practice. Besides, they sadly misinterpret and pervert his teaching and decry and minimize the value of all other teachers. They do not recognize the entire Scriptures as the infallible rule of faith and practice.

But there is a sense in which the term Christocentric can be used by the most rigid orthodoxy. We may even thank the inventors for furnishing a name so pertinent to the entire Scriptures. A new nomenclature is sometimes very happy in expounding and elucidating the old truth. There is a proper sense in which the entire Scriptures are Christocentric. It was said that all roads in the Roman empire led to Rome. Or, to use a more homely illustration, all the spokes of the wheel centre in the hub. No Rome, no roads. No hub, no spokes. The mutuality is obvious.

There is no great event mentioned in the Scriptures, no great doctrine, no ritual and forms of worship, no

moral law, no promise of salvation, no providential control, no divine activity, which does not stand in the closest logical and casual relations to Christ. We need not argue this in exhaustive detail, nor do we propose to do so.

We need only take a sweeping glance at the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation to justify and verify the Christocentric character of the entire Scriptures. Why else is language exhausted in giving him seventy-five or one hundred names and titles expressive of his attributes and works? Why else may we identify the Lord of the Old Testament and the Lord of the New? Why else is his name, Jehovah, mentioned seven thousand times in the Old Testament? Why else is he represented as the mediator of all the covenants?

It has been well argued that if the supernatural were stricken out of the Scriptures there would be nothing left. Strike out all that pertains to Christ, from his first creative act to the promise of his second coming in clouds and great glory, and what have we left?

Again we thank the inventors for this term which so aptly expresses the relations of the entire Scriptures to Christ. Personally, the author could think of no happier topic with which to close his "One Hundred Brief Bible Studies."